

Society for the Protection  
of Ancient Buildings.

---

31770

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT  
OF  
THE COMMITTEE.

913.09  
S.P.A.B. ———

21st JUNE, 1878.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 31770 .....

Date. 14. 6. 57 .....

Call No. 913. 09 / S. P. A. B .....



### Committee.

G. AITCHISON.  
W. C. ALEXANDERS.  
EUSTACE BALFOUR.  
J. W. BARNES.  
Rt. Hon. EARL OF BECTIVE,  
M.P.  
Rt. Hon. G. C. BENTINCK,  
M.P.  
J. F. BENTLEY.  
G. P. BOYCE.  
Rev. J. S. BREWER.  
H. W. BREWER.  
Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE.  
JAMES BRYCE.  
F. W. BURTON, F.S.A.  
INGRAM BYWATER.  
P. H. CALDERON, R.A.  
Rt. Hon. LORD CARLING-  
FORD.  
THOMAS CARLYLE.  
J. COMYNS CARR.  
C. G. CLEMENT.  
Professor S. COLVIN.  
LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P.  
Rt. Hon. EARL COWPER, K.G.  
Sir GEO. WEBB DASENT.  
W. DE MORGAN.  
RICHARD DOYLE.

EDWIN EDWARDS.  
F. S. ELLIS.  
Rev. WHITWELL ELWIN.  
C. J. FAULKNER.  
WICKHAM FLOWER.  
Miss R. GARRETT.  
Rev Canon GREENWELL.  
Hon. N. GROSVENOR.  
Hon. R. GROSVENOR.  
JOHN HEBB.  
J. P. HESELTINE.  
J. E. HODGSON, A.R.A.  
Lord HOUGHTON.  
GEO. HOWARD.  
SAMUEL HUGGINS.  
A. W. HUNT.  
W. HOLMAN HUNT.  
E. BURNE JONES.  
CHARLES KEENE.  
CHARLES G. LELAND.  
Rev. W. J. LOFTIE.  
Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart.,  
M.P.  
NORMAN MACCOLL.  
F. MACMILLAN.  
H. STACY MARKS, A.R.A.  
A. B. MITFORD.  
Lord MONTEAGLE.

A. J. MUNDELLA, M.P.  
 Rev. T. W. NORWOOD, F.G.S.  
 J. W. OAKES, A.R.A.  
 W. W. OULESS, A.R.A.  
 COVENTRY PATMORE.  
 Rev. MARK PATTISON.  
 E. J. POYNTER, R.A.  
 G. W. REID.  
 W. B. RICHMOND.  
 Mrs. R. T. W. RITCHIE.  
 G. F. ROLPH.  
 Professor JOHN RUSKIN.  
 W. B. SCOTT.  
 TEMPLE SOANES.  
 L. STEPHEN.  
 F. G. STEPHENS.  
 J. J. STEVENSON.

L. ALMA TADEMA, A.R.A.  
 Lord TALBOT DE MALAHIDE.  
 H. VIRTUE TEBBS.  
 The LORD BISHOP OF TRURO.  
 S. TUCKER, *Rouge Croix*.  
 Rev. Canon VENABLES.  
 G. C. VINALL.  
 H. WALLIS.  
 GEO. Y. WARDLE.  
 T. WARDLE.  
 P. WEBB.  
 Earl of WHARNCLIFFE.  
 F. A. WHITE.  
 A. STUART WORTLEY.  
 W. ALDIS WRIGHT.  
 Hon. PERCY WYNDHAM,  
 M.P.

*(With power to add to their number.)*

**Honorary Secretary.**

WILLIAM MORRIS, 26, Queen Square, Bloomsbury,  
 London, W.C.

**Honorary Treasurer.**

ALFRED MARKS, 52, Cornhill, London, E.C.

## Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.

IN putting forth this First Annual Report since the institution of our Society, the Committee cannot but regret, considering how widely-spread and rapid has been both the destruction and falsification of our ancient monuments during the last twenty years, that some such society as this was not long ago called into existence ; a society with the principal aim of guarding the life and soul of those monuments, so to speak, and not their bodies merely ; a society that might have impressed upon the public the duty of preserving jealously the very gifts that our forefathers left us, and not merely their sites and names.

This lack heretofore of such a body as ours (the result among us, who love art and history, of timidity, or despair) perhaps is, the Committee thinks, all the more to be regretted as its existence for the past year has brought out the fact that there has been lying, little

expressed, a great amount of public opinion in favour of the principles which it represents. Some part of this opinion has already attached itself openly to the Society, and more, we doubt not, will every day be attracted to it, and will express itself by its means. But apart from this open and obvious support, we think that the Society will act upon a much greater body of the public, so that its views will grow steadily and insensibly, and become more or less the views held both by the guardians of our ancient buildings, and also by those professional gentlemen in whose hands the fate of these works of art to a great measure lies.

The Committee therefore thinks that the main business of the Society, and surely a very useful one, is this putting forward a rallying point for the collecting and expressing of that rational opinion on this matter, which it once hoped, and now knows for certain, exists abundantly in this country.

As for the means by which the Committee has tried to keep itself before the public; it has taken in hand a great deal of work, which has hitherto necessarily been of a more or less tentative nature, but has certainly sufficed to show how much it may find to do, which may help its purpose of turning public attention to the intrinsic value of our ancient buildings, and the grievous loss we incur by their

destruction, and of teaching how much that value, both artistic and historical, depends on their being preserved in a genuine condition. As the sphere and influence of the Society spreads, new channels will doubtless be found in which to direct its energies. One of these, for example, the Committee may be allowed to suggest even now. Up to the present time the Society has confined its efforts to the defence of the monuments of our own country, but, of course, it cannot be unconscious how much such efforts are needed for the preservation of the interest that is yet left to the ancient buildings of the rest of Europe; in many parts of which there has both been more to destroy and more ignorant and reckless destruction than in England. The magnitude of the undertaking only has prevented the Committee from taking active measures in this most important matter, in which, for the rest, it is convinced that there is little time to be lost, if anything is to be done.

To go into details as to the direct work of the Society since its foundation, it has received a great number of letters from various parts of the kingdom relating to demolition and so-called restoration, contemplated or in progress. Every case thus brought under the notice of the Committee has received its careful attention, and where there has seemed to be a possibility of the Society using its influence to any good purpose, steps have been

taken to carry out their views. Protests have been written and sent to the proper authorities in about forty instances of contemplated restoration or destruction. Members of the Committee have reported after personal visits in many cases, and have used their personal influence to prevent harm being done. It is difficult to tell what direct effect the protests of the Society may have had, but some cases have come within our notice where the Society's protests have been directly successful, and we are satisfied that in most we have strengthened the hands of those who were opposing the proposed so-called restorations, and have minimized the harm done, and have made it more difficult to tamper with other works of art in the neighbourhood.

It is obviously most important to the Society in carrying out its work, nay, it is a foundation as it were of that work, that it should have correct and detailed information concerning those ancient buildings left more or less untampered with. As one convenient and direct way of obtaining such information, the Committee has had printed a tabular form for giving the complete description of a church, which will shortly be in the hands of every member of the Society; and it hopes to obtain, also, additional help in this matter by sending these out to the clergy far and wide. By this and other means it expects to get a tolerably complete list of all the unrestored



churches in Great Britain; and it is to be hoped that every member of the Society will take up the matter as one of personal interest to himself. It may be mentioned here that a member of the Committee, Mr. Coventry Patmore, has suggested (by letter) the publishing of a pamphlet, to be made up from the materials so collected, and has offered to subscribe the sum of £10 towards a special fund for this purpose. As the Committee thoroughly approves of Mr. Patmore's suggestion, and as the ordinary funds of the Society will not allow of devoting money to such publication, it gratefully accepted Mr. Patmore's munificent offer, and is glad now to lay the fact before the Society at large. As to the information already collected on this head, the Committee has information of 749 ancient and quite unrestored churches in England and Wales. Of these the greater number are situated in the counties of Buckinghamshire, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Lincolnshire, and Oxfordshire. They have at present not been able to collect much reliable information respecting the unrestored churches in the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, Lancashire, Shropshire, Gloucestershire, Northamptonshire, Herefordshire, Rutland, Huntingdonshire, and Hampshire, or the counties of Wales; nor has their present information dealt much with Scotland nor Ireland.

The subject is, however, being attended to by your Committee, and it is hoped that by next autumn a body of information will have been obtained about these localities that may put most of them on the same footing as the counties already dealt with. It is encouraging to remark that so great has been the mass of fine architecture left us by our ancestors, that in spite of all the damage done by restoration and destruction, there is still much left quite untouched, besides what has been left not utterly falsified. The county of Surrey has suffered most—almost, indeed, to the extinction of genuinely ancient buildings; Essex (a county of small and unpretending, though often most interesting, churches) has perhaps suffered least; and Norfolk may be set beside it, a happy fact when we think of its riches in furniture, stained glass, and the like.

The Committee would call attention here to the immense help that the various archæological and architectural societies throughout the kingdom would be to us in this collecting of information, if they would consent to set their hands to the work—a work, we should think, very congenial to many of their members.

The Committee has devoted much attention to the dissemination of pamphlets bearing directly upon the evils of restoration, thinking that by this means the aims and scope of the Society will become more generally under-



stood and appreciated. Many of its members have been most active in expressing its views publicly, and these utterances your Committee has made it part of its business to circulate. Of these we may mention Mr. J. J. Stevenson's paper, read before the Institute of Architects last year, and which excited much attention at the time. Last March Mr. G. Aitcheson read a paper on the subject before the Social Science Congress at Aberdeen, and last September another paper before the Art Club at Liverpool. The Rev. W. J. Loftie contributed an article to *Macmillan's Magazine* in June of last year, which brought out much discussion, and Professor Colvin last October did as much in the *Nineteenth Century*. All these papers have been widely circulated, together with the now famous and most eloquent passage from Professor John Ruskin's "Seven Lamps of Architecture"; a protest unfortunately as much needed now as it was years ago. As a matter of course, also, the paper first put forth by the Society has been sent on every occasion of calling attention to the Society's existence.

The Committee is happy to call the attention of the Society to some causes for congratulation. It has had encouraging correspondence in many cases, both with the clergy and patrons of livings, who have asked for advice in dealing with the necessary repairs of the buildings under their care. The Society has already been

much noticed by the Press, always with respect, and generally with unqualified approval. The *Athenæum*, which has the honourable distinction of having for years past steadily and courageously resisted the follies of Restoration, has never failed in its support of the Society; *Punch* has given us good help both with pen and pencil; and a clever artist in *Fun* has seen his opportunity in the subject, and seized upon it with goodwill. There have been serious and for the most part sympathetic articles on the Society in the *Globe*, *Daily Telegraph*, *Daily News*, *Guardian*, *Architect*, *Whitehall Review*, *Graphic*, *Truth*, &c., besides many of the leading country journals; and we have every reason to believe that these articles reflect a growing feeling in favour of our principles, both among men and women, throughout the country.

Nevertheless, the work to be done is heavy; and even now mere cynically brutal destruction, not veiling itself under any artistic pretence, is only too common: it is still only too commonly assumed that any considerations of Art must yield if they stand in the way of money interests. In fact, it is hard to convince people in general that the art in our ancient buildings is a real solid possession. The Committee thinks it timely to call your attention here to the threatened gradual destruction of what is left of the old churches in the City of London. We have only to think of London deprived of the interest

and variety that their steeples give to it, to get an idea of how grievous their loss will be. Historic, curious, characteristic, and in many cases beautiful, there must be few people indeed of any cultivation who will not regret them. Scarcely anyone, we think, of any feeling for art, history, or civilization, who will not echo the following words of one of our greatest authors, which the Committee is happy to insert in this Report :

Mr. Thomas Carlyle writes to us thus on the subject :  
“ I can have but little hope that any word of mine can help you in your good work of trying to save the Wren Churches in the City from destruction ; but my clear feeling is, that it would be a sordid, nay sinful, piece of barbarism to do other than religiously preserve these churches as precious heirlooms ; many of them specimens of noble architecture, the like of which we have no prospect of ever being able to produce in England again.”

We do find it strange, indeed, that the richest country and city in the world grudges to the Arts the few feet of ground that these ancient monuments occupy ; and the Committee thinks it a worthy work of this Society to rouse public opinion on the subject, and call the attention of the public to the loss that they are sustaining in the demolition of these buildings, which are nearly all doomed, and are coming down quietly but surely, church after church : it is the intention, therefore, of the Com-

mittee to publish a pamphlet, and to take other measures with this object, shortly.

Before making an end of this report, the Committee would like to call the attention both of members of the Society and of the public generally to two points especially on which the Society is likely to be misunderstood. We have probably all of us heard our Society accused, in the face of the declaration of the first paper we put forth, of being ourselves the favourers of that ruin and destruction from which we profess to defend our ancient monuments. We should like to protest once more against this misunderstanding, and to declare what a grief it is to us to come across the results, the unfortunately irreparable results, of neglect and brutality, and what a pleasure to look on a building which, owing to reverent and constant care, still stands trim and sound, with no wilfulness of which to accuse the hand of man, with nothing to regret except the inevitable lapse of time, and the slow and gentle decay it has brought with it ; and how slow that may be, the most ancient buildings in the world yet bear witness, and will do so for many a hundred years.

Again, to look facts in the face once more, we have many of us met with a tendency to saddle on us an undue regard for certain forms of art, certain styles of architecture ; an accusation (as we must call it) founded on

the necessity our principles enforce upon us to protest against the wholesale contempt, and consequent widespread destruction, of all the architectural works accomplished in this country after a certain date. We desire to declare emphatically that the Society neither has the will nor the power to enter into any "battle of the styles;" and we beg to inform the public that it counts amongst its members persons of every shade of artistic opinion, and differing widely in their artistic sympathies, whose common bond is earnest opposition at once to neglect and meddling in matters concerning all buildings that have any claim to be considered works of art. Our enemies are the enemies of the works of all styles alike, ignorant destruction and pedantic reconstruction.

To conclude: if only we can get a little breathing-space we believe that this Society will be of at least some service; we think that there are many among those who have to deal with ancient buildings, who do really feel the force of our reasoning on this matter, and that already restorations when they take place stand a good chance of not being so sweeping as they once would have been. Many other persons of cultivation also we believe do really at heart fully agree with us, and probably no few of these would openly join the Society if they did not belong to that class of mind which the enunciation of any principle frightens. These last, men



rather too logical to be thoroughly practical, we would remind of the necessity of having some distinct rallying-point for collecting the genuine feeling on this subject, hitherto scattered and helpless ; and then, that necessity being admitted, we would further remind them of the need of some wide but distinctly enounced test, to serve as a bond for that unity of thought and action, which alone can impress the public with the sense of a growing feeling, founded upon reason and common sense.

**S**ociety for the Protection  
of Ancient Buildings.

---

The Second Annual Meeting  
of the Society.

Report of the Committee  
thereat read.

---

28th JUNE, 1879.

---

WILLIAM MORRIS,

*Hon. Sec.*





Committee.

G. AITCHISON.  
W C. ALEXANDER.  
T. ARMSTRONG.  
EUSTACE BALFOUR.  
J. W. BARNES.  
Rt. Hon. EARL OF BECTIVE,  
M.P.  
Rt. Hon. G. C. BENTINCK,  
M.P.  
J. F. BENTLEY.  
G. P. BOYCE.  
H. W. BREWER.  
Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE.  
JAMES BRYCE.  
F. W. BURTON, F.S.A.  
INGRAM BYWATER.  
Rt. Hon. LORD CARLING-  
FORD.  
THOMAS CARLYLE.  
J. COMYNS CARR.  
H. J. CHAMBERLAIN.  
C. G. CLEMENT.  
Professor S. COLVIN.  
LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P.  
Rt. Hon. Earl COWPER, K.G.  
Sir GEO. WEBB DASENT.  
W. DE MORGAN.  
RICHARD DOYLE.  
EDWIN EDWARDS.

F. S. ELLIS.  
Rev. WHITWELL ELWIN.  
C. J. FAULKNER.  
WICKHAM FLOWER.  
Miss R. GARRETT.  
Rev Canon GREENWELL.  
Hon. N. GROSVENOR.  
Hon. R. C. GROSVENOR.  
JOHN HEBB.  
J. P. HESELTINE.  
J. E. HODGSON, A.R.A.  
J. R. HOLLIDAY.  
Rt. Hon. Lord HOUGHTON.  
GEO. HOWARD, M.P.  
SAMUEL HUGGINS.  
A. W. HUNT.  
W. HOLMAN HUNT.  
E. BURNE JONES.  
CHARLES KEENE.  
WM. KENRICK.  
S. WAYLAND KERSHAW,  
M.A.  
CHARLES G. LELAND.  
Rev. W. J. LOFTIE.  
Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart.,  
M.P.  
NORMAN MACCOLL.  
F. MACMILLAN.  
H. STACY MARKS, R.A.

*Committee.*

A. B. MITFORD.  
 F. W. MOODY.  
 A. J. MUNDELLA, M.P.  
 Rev. T. W. NORWOOD, F.G.S.  
 J. W. OAKES, A.R.A.  
 W. W. OULESS, A.R.A.  
 COVENTRY PATMORE.  
 Rev. MARK PATTISON.  
 E. J. POYNTER, R.A.  
 G. W. REID.  
 Prof. W. B. RICHMOND.  
 Mrs. R. THACKERAY RITCHIE  
 E. R. ROBSON.  
 G. F. ROLPH.  
 Professor JOHN RUSKIN.  
 W. B. SCOTT.  
 TEMPLE SOANES.  
 L. STEPHEN.  
 F. G. STEPHENS.  
 J. J. STEVENSON.  
 Rev. D. F. STEWART.

L. ALMA TADEMA, R.A.  
 Rt. Hon. Lord TALBOT DE  
 MALAHIDE.  
 H. VIRTUE TEBBS.  
 Rt. Rev. The LORD BISHOP  
 OF TRURO.  
 S. TUCKER, *Rouge Croix*.  
 H. F. TURLE.  
 Rev. Canon VENABLES.  
 G. C. VINALL.  
 GEO. Y. WARDLE.  
 T. WARDLE.  
 P. WEBB.  
 Rt. Hon. Earl of WHARN-  
 CLIFFE.  
 F. A. WHITE.  
 T. J. WILLSON.  
 A. STUART WORTLEY.  
 W. ALDIS WRIGHT.  
 Hon. PERCY WYNDHAM,  
 M.P.

*(With power to add to their number.)*

*Honorary Secretary.*

WILLIAM MORRIS, 26, Queen Square, Bloomsbury,  
 London, W.C.

*Honorary Treasurer.*

ALFRED MARKS, 52, Cornhill, London, E.C.

*Corresponding Secretary for Italy.*

C. FAIRFAX MURRAY, Sienna, Tuscany.

*Secretary.*

T. NEWMAN MARKS, 9, Buckingham Street, Strand, W.C.

## Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.

---

*THE SECOND ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF  
THIS SOCIETY WAS HELD AT WILLIS'S ROOMS,  
ON THE 28<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 1879, THE HON. PERCY  
WYNDHAM, M.P., IN THE CHAIR.*

The CHAIRMAN said :—" The Secretary has received from Sir John Lubbock, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Leckie, and others, letters stating their concurrence with the objects of this Society, and that they are unable to attend to-day ; also a letter from Mr. Higgins, of Liverpool, who was one of the first promoters of this Society. He trusts that we may be successful in our attempt to save the churches of the City of London from destruction.

" I am afraid that what you will hear to-day cannot have much of the attraction of novelty, because the objects of this Society are of course the same as they were last year, and very little remains to be said in regard to those objects beyond what has been already said or written.

The Society has now been in existence more than two years, and I think we are beginning to see what our aim should be in order to effect the objects we have in view, namely, the preservation of the Ancient Buildings of this country; and I believe the aim should be no less than an attempt to change the whole attitude or point of view from which the public estimate this question of restoration. Instead of allowing the burden of proof to rest with those who defend the building, it must be made to rest with those who would interfere with the building.

“Now of course the Society is perfectly aware that restoration must take place; but it has too often been shown, even in the last year, and some of you have seen it in the pamphlet regarding the churches in the county of Norfolk, that money subscribed for restoration is very often worse than wasted in putting in choir sittings and coloured cathedral glass, and thus, when the money subscribed by the liberality of the people is exhausted, the really important work of restoration, that of keeping up the fine old oak roofs, has either to be left undone altogether or something meaner put up instead. Now I believe that in endeavouring to change the supposed opinion of the people of this country, we have in reality the great mass of them with us (hear, hear).”

“The number of people who care for architecture is very large, though as a matter of fact it is not the architecture which they care about, but the associations connected with the buildings. It stands to reason that, given two buildings of equal merit as to architectural

conception and workmanship, that which is the older must be the more interesting. Therefore in the same way the Ancient Buildings and Churches must be more interesting than those with which restorers would replace them, and nothing, Ladies and Gentlemen, shows this more clearly than the fact, that those who are most eager for restoration are most anxious for the fidelity of their imitations. Now I am aware it may be said that the great builders of former days were in their day restorers; well, to a certain extent they were, and though we cannot expect to build like them, we can at least exceed them in this, in showing respect for past history, which they from ignorance could not do. But they never restored in the way it is the fashion to do in the present day, levelling up or down according to the fancy or taste of the architect, and not in keeping with the old building or the particular epoch or time (hear, hear). Their restorations were more in the character of additions, and not like what we do now.

“The aim of this Society should be to prevent the mutilating hand of fashion having anything to do with the question of restoration, and, in order to carry that out, the taste of individuals, whether for Gothic or Classic architecture, should be so guided as to respect everything which is good in itself, whether they approve of the style or not, even in the mansions scattered throughout the country. A gentleman, who lived some time ago, pulled down his Gothic house and built one in the classic style in vogue in the time of Charles II. He then pulled

down the Gothic church also, as he could not bear that the Almighty should inhabit a structure of such a wretched style, in his opinion, while he lived in a fine classic one. We can imagine the feeling of consternation with which the successor to that property looked upon the work of his predecessor when, twenty or thirty years ago, the Gothic revival began. Probably that church has been again restored, and therefore the church which had become classic is once more Gothic.

“The object of this Society should be so to change the point of view that the burden of proof may lie with those who would interfere with our old buildings.

“Gentlemen, I will now call upon the Hon. Secretary to read the report.”

The Honorary Secretary, Mr. MORRIS, then read

## THE REPORT.

In putting forth their Second Annual Report, the Committee feel that while they have undoubtedly to congratulate the Society on the progress made by its principles, the nature of their work is little altered from what it was last year.

It must be remembered that as so much of that work is of a negative character, is preventive rather than creative, it is not easy to show the obvious signs of success that attend some undertakings; while on the other hand the Committee are apt to see most of the discouraging side of the matter, because the greater part of their work consists in protesting and advising in cases in which there is not much hope of direct success,



since such schemes have already gone far before the Society can get to know of them. Nevertheless these protests cannot be regarded as useless; in most cases there are some people concerned who are anxious for such support as the Society can give them, and, even in the worst, their earnest appeal to care and patience will often save something of value, and prevent the most sweeping changes; in the meantime even unsuccessful protests are sure to breed doubt in some minds that have not hitherto thought of the subject, and to make those already inclined to treat ancient buildings with reverence, more disposed to thorough care and forbearance in their practical dealings with them.

Taking these things into consideration therefore, the Society has, on the whole, no cause to be disappointed with the results of its work since its foundation. It is certain that the general tone of the public is decidedly more favourable to its principles than when it was first started.

Further on, in dealing with the principal buildings which the Society has had before it, examples will be found which tend to confirm this view of the matter. Meantime the Committee may call attention to the fact that the public press which, as noticed in the First Annual Report, has been from the first by no means discouraging to the Society, has of late been unequivocally in its favour; most helpful articles have appeared in the *Daily News*, *Standard*, *Echo*, *Athenæum*, *Globe*, &c., which doubtless Members will have noticed.

Before proceeding to call attention to the cases above referred to, the Committee think it right to beg the Members of the Society to note that it is rather the custom of its opponents, at all events of the least well

informed of them, to assume that the Society has no regard to the stability and good order of ancient buildings, that they rather delight in decay than try to prevent it. Certainly if there were any foundation for this view, the Society would be condemned with reason enough. The Committee need scarcely point out however that this misrepresentation was from the first foreseen, and met in distinct terms in the prospectus first put forth by them, and they only call Members' attention to this, because conventional misrepresentations are apt to stick, however far they may be from the truth; moreover they think that no opportunity should be lost of giving such misstatements unqualified denial.

To come to details of the work done during the past year: it was discovered that the business of the Society was so very onerous for the one General Committee that had been formed, that it became absolutely necessary to form Sub-Committees to carry on the work of the Society. A Restoration Committee was formed, which has had before it and has sifted the cases submitted to the Society throughout a great portion of the year.

A Committee to take notice of the condition of ancient buildings abroad, called the Foreign Committee, has also been constituted in accordance with a hope expressed in last year's Report, and has begun its work by putting itself into communication with archæological Societies in France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, &c. Enquiries have been set on foot respecting the state of ancient buildings in India, as also in Spain, where restoration is commencing. The prospectus of the Society has been translated into French, German, Italian, and Dutch, and steps have been taken to obtain Corresponding Members in each of these countries.



The Committee do not conceal from themselves the difficulties in their way in dealing with the state of buildings in foreign countries ; nor is it easy to overrate the necessity for caution in such dealings, but it is hoped that the efforts of the Society to prevent the falsification of monuments and the ruin of works of art, may attract attention abroad, and be commented upon in the public prints, and that its principles may be spread thereby.

Arrangements have been made for appointing local Honorary Correspondents in various parts of the country for the purpose of obtaining quick and accurate information of the threatened restoration or demolition of any ancient building. There are now 22 correspondents spread over 18 counties, and it is hoped that before long their number will be considerably increased.

The Committee being desirous to bring themselves into more frequent communication with the General Members of the Society, have determined in future to publish a Quarterly Report of their proceedings in as much detail as is possible, which will be sent to every Member of the Society.

Already Members of the Society will have had placed in their hands an interesting pamphlet detailing the condition of many churches in East Anglia, which district has been very much attacked by injudicious restoration. It is the intention of the Committee, if funds permit, to have similar pamphlets published of other districts, and it is to be hoped that the publication fund, which was originated by Mr. Coventry Patmore, will not remain a dead letter. Pamphlets like the one that has just been published are not only interesting to Members, but useful to the Society for reference.

Amongst the objects the Committee have taken in

hand is the preservation of the City Churches, and in this respect they are able to a certain extent to report favourably. Although St. Dionis Backchurch has been demolished, the interesting Church of St. Mary-at-Hill, Eastcheap, has, in spite of strenuous opposition, been saved. In this case much help was afforded by the "City Church and Churchyard Society." Owing however to the Union of Benefices Act, the City Churches are being continually threatened, and very great vigilance has to be exercised to secure early information of any proposed demolition, and to prevent a surprise. The Committee cannot help calling attention once more to the loss that Londoners and the country at large would incur by the demolition of these interesting and handsome buildings, which are such a rest both for the eye and the mind amidst the hurry of business London.

First of importance amongst the buildings which have been threatened with restoration is the great Abbey Church, now Cathedral, of St. Albans. The Society protested again and again against what it considers the rash and destructive scheme of altering and replacing the present roof, and the Committee are very sorry to say that these protests have not had the success which was hoped for, and that in all probability this work will soon be begun. At the same time, however much they regret the irreparable misfortune which is overhanging this magnificent building, they cannot help thinking that many of the incidents that have taken place with reference to this restoration are to a certain extent encouraging, and do confirm their view, expressed above, as to the spread of reasonable opinions on the subject of the fit way of dealing with our ancient buildings. In this case

at least the Society has been by no means alone in opposing the scheme of the restorers, but can count amongst those that agree with its views, outside its own body, many of the most distinguished architects and antiquarians in England, including the Society of Antiquaries, led by their President, the Earl of Carnarvon, Mr. Street, Mr. Blomfield, Mr. Christian, and Mr. John Evans, who resigned his position on the Committee for the restoration in consequence of the proposed action. In fact it may be said that the balance of opinion amongst those who are usually regarded by the public as capable of forming a responsible opinion on these matters, has been most decidedly in favour of the views advocated by the Society. Though this cannot console the Society for the damage about to be done to one of our grandest monuments, it may nevertheless give some hope as to other monuments that have not yet been tampered with.

The case of the interesting and beautiful buildings of Blundell's School, Tiverton, Devon, which were threatened with demolition, has taken up a good deal of the time and attention of the Committee. The architecture and fittings of the structure, dated 1599, have been figured in Dolman's book of Domestic Architecture. They are known to all architects, and are without doubt among the very best specimens in existence of the School architecture of a School-founding age; it had been proposed to remove the School from its present site and to sell the existing buildings, but there was considerable local feeling in favour of the site of the School not being removed; the Committee though not feeling themselves in a position to give any opinion on the question of removal, pointed out to the Charity Commissioners and others the great value of the buildings; they believe they

can claim to have influenced the decision which has been come to, *i.e.*, that in any case the buildings shall be respected and preserved.

The Carlol Tower, Newcastle-on-Tyne, the last remnant of the old fortifications of that City, is on the point of destruction, in spite of very general local opposition. The townspeople, at the suggestion of the Committee, sent a memorial to the Lords of the Treasury, which was supplemented by one from the Society. The result is still somewhat in doubt, as the members of the Town Council are very much divided in opinion on the matter.

Grasmere Church, Westmoreland, where the poet Wordsworth constantly attended, was threatened with restoration ; but a well-timed protest, and a letter written to the Patron, had the desired effect. The work of destruction which was just commencing was stopped, the Patron having vetoed the whole scheme.

The Committee heard a report that the fine old tower of St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich, was threatened to be rebuilt. They have since however heard with satisfaction from Mr. Street, who has been appointed consulting architect to the church, that nothing but necessary repairs will be undertaken.

Ormskirk Church has been twice threatened, and each time the Committee have interfered successfully. It is again threatened, and every effort is being used to prevent any injury being done to it. York Water-Gate, at the foot of Buckingham Street, Strand, the Metropolitan Board of Works proposed to remove to the entrance of the Gardens. The Committee memorialised the Board on that subject, and that scheme seems to have been abandoned ; but it is now proposed to raise the Gate

to a level with Buckingham Street, and make it a thoroughfare to the Gardens. As this would be tantamount to its destruction, such a proposal is obviously objectionable; the Board has therefore been again memorialised and other steps taken in order, if possible, to prevent this from being done.

It would make this report too long were the Committee to enter into details of all the buildings which have come under their notice; suffice it to say the foregoing instances are good specimens of the work which the Society has been able to accomplish.

The following is a list of the cases which have been brought under the notice of the Committee during the past year :—

Brailes Church.	Filey Church, Yorkshire.
Lambeth Palace Chapel.	St. Helen's Bishopsgate.
St. Catherine Cree, City.	Rye Church, Sussex.
Lavenham Church.	St. George's Ch., Windsor.
Cley next the Sea, Norfolk.	Machar Cathdrl., Aberdeen.
Charing Church, Kent.	St. Mary le-Bow, Cheap-
Kempley Church.	side, City.
Old Chapter House, St.	Skirclaugh Chapel, near
Paul's.	Hull, Yorkshire.
Haworth Ch., Yorkshire.	St. Mary-at-Hill, East-
Aldborough Ch., Suffolk.	cheap, City.
Wye Church.	Christ's Hospital, City.
Higham Gobion, Bed-	Mells Church, near Frome,
fordshire.	Somerset.
Adel Church, Yorkshire.	St. Germain's Cathedral,
York Water Gate, Buck-	Isle of Man.
ingham Street, Strand.	St. Mary Church, Bungay,
Norwich Cathedral.	Suffolk.

St. George's Tombland, Norwich.	Upton Noble Church.
St. Lawrence, Norwich.	Nantwich Ch., Cheshire.
Worstead Church.	St. Giles, Ch., Edinburgh.
St. Mary's, Ely.	Hawton Ch., Lincolnshire.
Thetford Grammar School.	Old Town Hall, Leicester.
S.S. Simon & Jude, Norwich	Old House, 165, Aldersgate Street, E.C.
St. Mary, Norwich.	Jesus Chapel, Chesterton Church, Cambridge.
S. Augustine's, Norwich.	St. Peter - in - the - East, Oxford.
Thorpe Church.	Street Front and Gate House, St. John's Col- lege, Oxford.
Wymondham Church.	Stratford-on-Avon Church.
St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich	
Priestbury Ch., Cheshire.	
Buckland Church, Kent.	
Heacham Ch., Norfolk.	

Several cases of dilapidation and neglect of old Castles and other buildings have come under the notice of the Committee. In each case representations have been made to the owners, generally eliciting satisfactory replies.

Instances also have occurred where clergymen and patrons have written to the Society, asking that a Report might be furnished them as to the condition of their churches, and to suggest what repairs were absolutely necessary. In every instance the Committee have sent down responsible Members to view and report upon the buildings in question.

There are many Churches which the Committee are at the present moment making efforts to preserve, to one of which more particularly they would desire to call the attention of the Members of the Society. Penton Mewsey Church is a most valuable example of fourteenth century architecture, and is threatened with absolute



demolition. Members will no doubt have seen that the Committee have advertised for subscriptions to the amount of £330, in order to pay that sum to the builder in lieu of the use of the materials of the old Church. Members and all others interested in the preservation of old buildings are invited to help in raising the amount required.

As regards the greater number of the cases dealt with by the Committee during the past year, although they have no certainty of their protests having been successful in preventing their restoration or demolition, yet they believe the action taken by the Society in respect of them has been conducive of much good in arousing public opinion on the subject, as they think will be apparent from the general tenor of this Report

In conclusion, the Committee beg to remind the Members that as the work of the Society increases (and it is already very large) it cannot possibly be carried on without increased funds. They would also be very grateful for additional assistance, both upon Committees and as local Honorary Correspondents in different counties, from those who have leisure, and who wish to forward the objects which the Society has in view. They would also recommend unceasing activity on the part of those who are already Members in increasing the number of the Society's subscribers.

MR. LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P. :—" Mr. Chairman, you have said very truly that it is not possible to treat the subject of our operations with much novelty, but if I cannot be novel in my observations I will endeavour to be brief, especially on a Saturday afternoon like this,

which to most of us is a holiday, and which seems to be one of the very earliest days of summer.

“Mr. Chairman, I have much satisfaction in moving the adoption of this report, because it appears to me to be the record of good work done, and to indicate a great deal of bad work prevented. It is of course true, as has been observed in the report, that the Committee often see and hear of the bad work when it is already begun and they are too late to prevent its being proceeded with. It is no doubt discouraging to see so much mischief already perpetrated and so much contemplated which they must sometimes fail to arrest, but they must also be aware, Mr. Chairman, and it is some satisfaction to reflect upon it, that if they do not stop mischief being done in particular cases brought before their notice, they will be efficient in preventing mutilation in other directions. You are too late to stop the restoration of the church in one parish, but the stir you make, and the remonstrances you put forth, will prevent people undertaking similar work in the next parish. That is a great satisfaction, and a satisfaction which ought to comfort the Committee when they find that their labours are apparently ineffectual.

“Mr. Chairman, in the report we have referred to a special work, that of arresting the destruction of our City Churches, and I think it will be generally felt that our Society has been useful in one respect—in helping to save the church of St. Mary-at-Hill, in the City. The City Churches of course are, and have been, the prey of the designs of many people who have been actuated by the



best of motives ; they have thought that they could do good service to the Church, as a religious organisation, in tearing and pulling down the edifices in the City and building new churches in the suburbs out of the proceeds of the sites of the churches destroyed. But I should be sorry if we were indeed so poor in money and spirit that it would be necessary to find funds for the building of new churches by proceeding in this way. If we have a work to do, as we have in London, I think we of this generation ought to be able to undertake that work with our own resources as our forefathers did before us, and it is not quite unnecessary to preserve all those monuments which are in themselves so remarkable as works of art, so dear and so delightful to the eye as a reproof and a relief to the ever-crowding life in London. When the destruction of this particular church was contemplated and threatened, I took an opportunity, I am ashamed to say for the first time, of visiting it, and this feeling of shame was very strong in me when I got inside. The first sensation was of delight mixed with a little pity : we compass sea and land, we go to and fro, we visit a city on the Continent, and we are not at rest until we have seen every one of its churches ; and here we have absolutely at our own doors a group of churches in their kind not in any way inferior to those that are presented to us elsewhere ! Indeed, nowhere in Christian Europe, except in Rome itself, do you find churches possessing precisely the same qualities of delightfulness as you will find in Sir C. Wren's churches in the City of

London ; and to pull them down is not only to do injury to our forefathers and their memory, but to do injury to ourselves, in destroying that which should be a continual source of delight. I think, Mr. Chairman, we shall prevent the pulling down of some churches with which we are threatened ; but the function of this Society is not only to prevent churches being pulled down, but also to prevent their going through that most fatal process of being *restored* (hear, hear), and this process, I am sorry to say, is prevalent in the City as well as that of pulling down. Too many of the City Churches are endowed with funds for their maintenance, which funds are really perverted to their destruction. The means of doing ill deeds makes ill deeds to be done, and we have to struggle against the intrusive mischief of renovating hands. You can go through the City and find Churches in which the free and ample spirit of Sir C. Wren's design is transformed into a cramped and servile spirit of architecture totally alien from his design, and totally foreign to his ideas of grace and spaciousness, and it is the greatest offence that transformation and renovation should be going on.

“Now, Mr. Chairman, we are often accused of being destroyers and of letting things go to ruin, and that in preventing restoration we are really preventing the keeping of things in existence. It will be no secret to you, Sir, that I am not in all things a Conservative ; there are many things which we must be content to see die or changed ; indeed, I entirely recognise the necessity and even the use of this in many things. We ourselves will come to

an end some day or other (hear, hear), and we cannot allow our lives to be overburdened and crushed down by the mere accumulation of the dead things of the past. I sometimes feel a little concerned for what will happen to the people of the next generation if they live or try to live with their lives pressed down by the mass of trifling details we are accumulating to burden their memories and their intellectual energies (hear, hear). But I think the real principle of our action is this, *let dead things go, let living things be kept*, and let them be kept as they came from the minds of their creators, and not kept in the false light of transformed conditions totally alien from the minds of those who gave them forth (hear, hear, and cheers). These are the true principles of our Society, and the three things we fight against are—the principle of renovation, the principle of transformation, and the principle of restoration (hear, hear). We object to old things being put before us in a new fashion—I call this a forgery of the worst character. In the kindred art of painting, if anybody presumes to copy a picture, a work of poetic fancy, or paint it over again, and then put it forward as the result of the genius which created it, we at once brand it as a forgery, as infamous and criminal. We have to deal with this in architecture, and we feel precisely the same towards transformation and renovation in buildings as in the case of the picture—in both it is wrong to impute to a man that which we may vainly regard as his work, but which he never contemplated and never made. For in art, as in other matters, acts of forgery are guilty acts,

and we ought as far as possible to resist that kind of action. As long as a thing exists we should help others to contemplate and enjoy it in communion with the human spirit of its original creator ; by all means keep it alive, for it is helping to keep alive past memories by its very existence. Do not spoil your own moral life, as well as spoil your appreciation of the good and true, by transforming what has been faithfully handed down to you, into something different from what it was.

“ Now, Mr. Chairman, I will only add one or two words more. I am delighted to see that the functions of this Society are to be extended out of England as far as possible, as we must consider that in trying to stimulate people elsewhere we shall get a reaction towards ourselves ; and our travelled members know that in some countries the fatal work of renovation is even more vigorously pursued than by ourselves. It was said by Mr. Sterne, that ‘ they manage things better in France,’ but it is unhappily true that in France they are carrying on restoration, and that in the worst fashion ; it is also mentioned that this bad business has begun in Spain. We shall not be able to obtain the co-operation and influence of the Governments of these countries in our endeavours to put a stop to this work of renovation and restoration. But there is a country where, if we are allowed, we may be of some assistance—in India. In one part of India there are the most wonderful works of art built under the orders of the great Mogul kings. In Agra, in Delhi, and in Futtehpore Sikkri, you will find

triumphs of art very different from our own, but triumphs of a very precious character, which ought to be carefully treasured. It is extremely interesting to the traveller in India to find himself in such a city as that of Futtehpore Sikkri, built by Akbar, but deserted almost as soon as built, interesting as lying far away from the haunts of men, where he will find groups of buildings which have been subjected to no other destroying influence than the hand of Nature; and indeed in that clime Nature's influences have been so benignant, that these buildings remain in all their freshness and beauty, much as they were when they were executed under the emperors of Delhi. But where we live and have our sway, and the Public Works Department have been and are in action, you will find a deadly influence has been and is at work. You will find the lovely productions of Mussulman art falsified and debased. Now I do hope we shall be able to stop that at least, and by doing this good work at home we shall be able to extend our influence to British India, and save many important buildings. I am sure we shall do this by the stir we are making, though I believe these errors occur through ignorance rather than design (cheers). They have no feeling whatever, that in meddling with old buildings they are doing a wrong; and if we honestly tell them that to interfere with a building is to interfere with the design of the founder, we shall save them from doing that mischief, or if we do not, we shall be doing some good by letting them know that there are a set of people who will make a stir whenever they ignorantly intermeddle with old

buildings ; and if they get to understand that they are what our grandfathers called Goths and what we call Philistines, they will be a little abashed and perhaps restrained from such ruinous action.

"We must admit that the Society has done good work, and worthy, I am sure, of the support and influence of each member. I have great pleasure in moving the adoption of the report." (Cheers).

The Rt. Hon. G. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, M.P., in the absence of Mr. G. A. SALA, seconded the adoption of the Report.

Professor BRYCE, who moved the first Resolution, said :—"The Resolution which I have been requested to move is as follows :—

*"That this Meeting, recognising the value of Ancient Buildings to the Student of History, whether general or local, deprecates all alterations in and restorations of such buildings which may obliterate their historical character and features,"*

and that resolution appears to me to state a proposition which is so simple as to require comparatively little argument or enforcement on my part.

"I feel some little shame in asking you to look at the resolution from the standpoint of that humble, obscure, and dull—but still useful individual, the student of history : but it is from this very point of view of the student of history that I wish you to consider the claims this Society has upon your active sympathy and support



“ Now of all the arts and sciences which are the handmaids of history—and history may be said to sum up all the human arts and sciences—among all these there are none, in many points, so intimate with human thoughts and deeds as the art of architecture. There is no kind of historical evidence which is so precious, so certain, so incontrovertible, as that supplied by an ancient building; traditions may err, chronicles may be spoiled by partiality, and documents may be falsified, but a building—at least until restoration set in some thirty years ago—was a history, and its historical evidence could not deceive: it spoke, in the clearest and most distinct language, of the thoughts and tastes, the skill, the purposes and the resources of those who erected it; and it had a further value to the historian, it communicated to him the influences which had been at play upon those who lived and toiled and battled; and those who have studied a building and the history of the place where it was erected, not merely in our own country, but still more in the various continental cities where the buildings indicate very different influences, must have been struck by the way in which the history of the past is illuminated, and how the influences exercised upon the people are seen in the growth of buildings in different countries by particular styles of architecture. In France, for instance, we have a variety of types of architecture which clearly show and mark different periods of time, and they therefore must be more interesting, because appealing more directly to our senses, than any history

can do. They show the different tendencies, the different influences, the different streams of artistic thought which were at play in the various parts of the country. The same influences on a smaller scale, and perhaps not written quite so distinctly, may be traced in the character of the buildings in parts of England. And you will observe that these buildings derive their scientific value and their historical interest from the harmonious relations which existed between all their parts. If we look at the arch, or a column, a window and its tracery, at the moulding of a tower or spire, and even at such simple things as courses of stones which are laid in the outer wall, we shall see a definite object and aim, and it is of paramount importance to the appearance of the whole that each should correspond to the other, and that if any part of the building is changed, the other parts are changed to be in keeping with it. And so our ancient buildings present in themselves a complete picture of the taste and skill displayed at any particular point of time. (Hear, hear).

“Now that being the condition of the buildings which this country derived as part of its heritage, how have the restorers endeavoured to deal with it? The restorer comes full of zeal, but zeal which is not in accordance with a knowledge of the building, and tries to improve it, but he is really the enemy of the ancient art of the middle ages. He reminds me of those Jews who by building sepulchres bear witness that they are the children of those who stoned the

prophets. He comes forward and undertakes to reform the architecture of the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries, and the masterly style engrafted upon it. This is not in accordance with the spirit of the mediæval builders, but in a spirit of false honour which would endeavour to prevent us glancing back into the history of the past; and instead of paying tribute and honour to those who lived in the brightest days of architecture, he is really pursuing the false policy of those who would substitute, as they think, something better.

“Now the restorer goes about his work sometimes simply as a destroyer, and then it seems to me there is a loss, a great loss, but still we are not perplexed, we can understand it; but when he insists, as is most frequently the case, upon transforming the building, and undertakes to put in new windows, or to alter the tracery, or substitute new mullions, or make those numerous changes with which we are too familiar, I must say we do not understand it. Ladies and Gentlemen, he seems to me to commit two crimes—the first is that he obliterates all the charm and the delight which we derive from such ancient buildings and labours of the past, that he destroys their value to us as showing us what they have passed through, of the condition of the place and the country at the time when the changes were made and the different purposes they were made to serve; and the second crime, which is graver than the first, and which converts him into an enemy, is because he introduces a forgery into the document and falsifies it, he makes it tell an untruth,

and he asks us to believe this work is of the 12th, 13th, or 14th century, and in that he seems to me to go beyond any offence which was committed by those very modernists of the 17th or 18th century whose work we are not inclined to favour. At any rate they do not ask us to regard the work of their own time as the work of an older and better time. They were true to themselves. They built in the style of their own time, and their work was sometimes good, and we value it because it was true—it expressed something of that which they cared for, and it is to us an imperishable and valuable record of the taste and thought of the men that produced it. But the modern restorer has nothing to tell, his work is merely a dream of what he can have no certainty about, they merely put worse in the place of better; but he takes the ancient building and he sends it down to posterity with a lie in its mouth. (Cheers.)

“In submitting this argument to you, I have been following the line indicated by the resolution in putting the subject as a question of the value of the historical evidence which these buildings supply to the student of general history of particular countries or districts. But there is another class in whom we ought to be more interested than in the student of history; that class is everybody who sees or uses these ancient buildings, everyone who values the past, and everyone who is glad to see in those relics that which will help imagination to raise itself back into that past in which lie the roots of our happiest and loftiest aspirations. (Hear and cheers.)

"I cannot help thinking that when we consider the case of those churches in the City of London to which reference has been made, or the ancient houses in some old thoroughfares, or those halls of the great City companies, of which I am happy to say some ten or twelve of architectural merit remain, I cannot help thinking that when passing through the busy streets, and though perhaps hurrying with business, the presence of these must carry us back to the point of time when London was really only a mile in circumference, to the time when these City companies were represented by trades and guilds, when the predecessors of the occupiers of the ancient palaces led their retainers to battle. If one feels so much on looking at these old halls, what should one feel when gazing upon the buildings which are intended to call one away from earth and to fix one's thoughts upon the highest things above.

"Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, if these are the feelings which we desire to have cherished, if we wish to see these records of the middle ages preserved, if we desire to save the precious things which are still left—in this the most modernised country of Europe—if we profess to care about history and to reverence her laws, and to show that we have learned the greatest lessons of both art and history, that history which is written in the unbroken development of art, let us one and all, both by public and private action, do what we can to help and aid the purposes of this Society. And whatever waves of change may pass over the public mind in matters

of taste it remains universally true, that art, like wisdom, is justified of all her children." (Cheers.)

Mr. MORRIS, in speaking to the Resolution, said :—  
"Everywhere I fancy it will be admitted that the study of history is a most important part of the cultivation of the present day ; nor will many be found to deny that the architectural monuments of the past are a great help to that study ; but perhaps not everybody understands how great a help they are, or how differently it would fare with the study of history, as it is now followed, if we lacked those monuments ; for you must remember how different that modern historical research is to the chronicling the story-telling of times past. The ancient chroniclers were laborious and conscientious men who loved their subject, and often dealt with it most dramatically and forcibly : all honour to their memory : doubtless the best modern historians honour them most. But so unbroken in those days was the chain that bound men to the past, so little possible it seemed to them that it could be broken, that neither the chroniclers nor their audience could conceive of their forefathers being different from them in any way. 'Such and such things happened then, such and such happen now, but men's thoughts and aspirations are the same now as then, and the ways of life that followed from those thoughts must have been the same : ' that is what they deemed of it unconsciously ; and much of the life and dramatic truth of their writing and their art springs from that blindness, which I think was happy both for them to have and for us to reap the advantage



of; which advantage, in short, is an accurate knowledge of the times these men lived in, their thoughts, their hopes, their ways of life: for side by side with the simplicity of the writer that of the artist was at work also, to show us at every turn what the writer meant; nay, to give us insight into much that the historian never thought of putting into words, being a cultivated man writing for great and lettered persons, while the artist was, in those days, any man who could handle a tool—who could not disguise himself even if he would, since the art of imitation had not yet been invented—so that it comes to this, that the innate and typical ideas of the ordinary mediæval Englishman are preserved to us in the works of art of his time: his own ideas mind, not those of other men or books, but his own, uninfluenced except by the general tendencies of the age. Must not this be a great part of history? Moreover, we of the present day can understand them just as they are: that is *our* birthright, *our* heritage; for in other days it was not so: men who saw the work wrought by their forefathers were compelled to translate it, as it were, before they could notice it: but we, so much has history changed from what it was, can understand these visible words of those who have gone before us, and by means of them enter into their lives. And I say this is the heritage they have left us, the fruit of their toil and their pleasure, the fruit of their unblamable and imaginative ignorance—simplicity, may I call it.

“Now this is one side of the value of the works

works we are met together to guard both from thoughtlessness and sordid destruction, and from rash falsification. I think you will resolve that the cause is a worthy one. For surely one of the characteristics of the present age is its tendency to retrospection; nor can I think it a weak or a foolish one: I will be bold to say that many of the best men among us look back much to the past, not with idle regret, but with humility, hope, and courage; not in striving to bring the dead to life again, but to enrich the present and the future: I may well use the word enrich, for if we of the present are not the more careful, the future will on some sides be but poor, I fear. Meantime, consider how large a part of all our lives this real and living history forms: the history whose life would starve and fade if it lacked such food as our old buildings can give it. I believe even many of those who are wholly unconscious of it are, nevertheless, deeply influenced by it; that if all that influence were suddenly taken from them, they would feel some blank and barren loss had befallen them: and if this is so now, surely it will be much more so as education spreads; surely in days to come people will feel ashamed of us, that we took so little trouble to guard the things they have heard told of as so precious; that we could not exercise something more of patience and forethought in arranging the relative claims of what our own lives compelled us to make for our immediate use, and what our honour and gratitude bade us hand down from our fathers to our children. For if a thing is seriously worth having, it is

worth making some sacrifice to keep ; nay, some sacrifice must be made, for certainly all possessions involve responsibility and trouble, yet people do not usually shrink from attaining them : and the old buildings that we love, with all the history that goes with them, are no worse in this respect than other property. These monuments, so precious a possession of this country, do bear with them a certain responsibility : we must either, as before said, deal with them carefully and patiently, or neglect the duty which cultivation and civilisation has imposed upon us as the descendants of those who built them : it is hard if we grudge this care to these tokens of the life and energy from which all our prosperity and hope have come. Much oftener than not, when such buildings have been destroyed, the sacrifice of apparent and immediate convenience involved in keeping them standing would have been but small : but for my part I am not so anxious for the reputation of a practical man as to shrink from declaring that, in my opinion, *great* sacrifices of apparent and immediate convenience should have been made in their behalf ; for I cannot think that England, with all her wealth, is rich enough to lose them, since in very truth all her wealth tenfold could not buy the making of one of them.

“ But also if they are worth keeping and worth making some sacrifice to keep, they must be worth the exercise of some patience also in dealing with their present condition, or else we shall advantage little that posterity, the dread of whose blame I was putting before you : for if

we hand our monuments down to them, pretending to be what they are not, we shall both puzzle and discourage them. What will they say, for instance, to the carving of the restored North Porch of Westminster Abbey? What credulous empty-heads they will think us, who have praised the art of the 13th century to them. What! they will say, this thin starved work, these smooth, tame, rubbed-down pieces of stone that are like nothing that is, or could be in nature, that are neither useful, beautiful, nor suggestive, is this the handiwork of the 13th century, of those men of eager hearts and skilful hands, the inheritors of long unbroken ages of skill and love of beauty (?) is that all they could do? we can learn nothing from them. Indeed I fear that if we do not bestir ourselves, such examples as these *will* be all they will have to judge from; and I say in that case we of this antiquarian age, not those of the past times of destruction, will be the guilty parties. It does indeed seem strange to me people cannot see how the times have changed, that they should insist on these lifeless pieces of reproduction. The workman of to-day is not an artist as his forefather was; it is impossible, under his circumstances, that he could translate the work of the ancient handicraftsman; and sure I am that if he were artist enough to be able to do so, he would refuse to try it. I say the workman of to-day is no artist: it is the hope of my life that this may one day be changed; that popular art may grow again in our midst; that we may have an architectural style, the growth of its own times, but connected with all history.

Now when that time has come we shall be able to judge, perhaps, as to the best way of dealing with our ancient monuments: now I call a truce with the restorers, and ask them, would it not be the part of prudent and patient men to wait till that time is come before the decision is made; meantime carefully repairing these treasures of art and keeping them weather-tight, which if the guardians of buildings had steadily done heretofore would have prevented all thought of restoration. It is never too late to restore a building; nay, it can be pulled down and rebuilt at any time; but most restorations have made it over-late to look for history or art in the buildings that have undergone them. As for that decision of the future times of perfect and living art, I am not afraid of it. When people shall have so learned art that they easily and habitually practice it, they will have learned many other things besides. I believe that then the little grey weather-beaten building, built by ignorant men, torn by violent ones, patched by blunderers, that has outlived so many hopes and fears of mankind, and yet looks friendly and familiar to them—I believe that this relic of past times will be no offence to the beauty and majesty of their streets. I believe they will feel no call to raise it to the level of their own perfection, or to strip it of all the fruit of its old age, and make it as it first was—clear and beautiful, without a history or a blemish: rather I believe they will honour it the more for the many minds and hands of men that have dealt with it, and they will religiously guard it as a holy symbol of all the triumphs

and tribulations of art—of art, the constant companion and expression of the life and aspirations of the world.”  
(Loud cheers.)

EARL COWPER :—“I rise to move the second resolution :—

*“That the work which the Society has carried out during the past year has been both important and useful, and that, in the opinion of this meeting, the Society is deserving of continued and energetic support.”*

“Owing to a mistake I made in the hour of meeting, I missed the earlier speeches, and I am very much afraid I may say something over again which has already been said. As there is nothing more distressing than to listen to a repetition, I shall be very sorry if this should happen.

“I think the resolution is one which will commend itself to you all. It is not so much the actual work that has been done, though that is not inconsiderable, as the increased knowledge which the public have of this Society, the increased influence which I think it has on the country, which really constitutes the good work it has done. By the Report you will see that among other things it has been instrumental in saving one of our City Churches, that of St. Mary-at-Hill, owing very much to the action of our Chairman: (Hear, hear.) it has also saved the buildings of an interesting old Grammar School at Tiverton, the old Church at Grasmere, which the poet Wordsworth constantly attended, and also several other



buildings, the names of which you will see in the Report. But, as I say, it is not on these grounds that I chiefly move this resolution. One of the greatest proofs of the influence of this Society in the country, and of its growing importance, lies in the amount of abuse it has received. Of course this Society has been the subject of much abuse and ridicule. It has been said that we wish to preserve old buildings covered with ivy and tumbling to pieces. We have been called by some clever persons the ruinistic school—I think we might call them the ruination school, for ruination is the only word to express what they have done. I can quite understand the indignation felt by some people against this Society. In former days the clergyman and the architect had it much their own way and did what they liked with our churches, and though this cannot always be stopped, they are now subjected to a certain amount of indignation which is fostered by this Society and the public opinion which it has created.

“I think myself it is perfectly abominable, even in the case of our most sacred monuments, that a small knot of men, selected nobody knows how or by whom, and very often entirely under the direction of a single man, should actually arrogate to themselves the power of mutilating, repairing, restoring, modernising, or doing what they like to them. (Loud cheers.)

“There is fortunately at all events one weapon in our hands, one weakness of human nature, which we can skilfully turn to our advantage. It is that it requires very

little to induce a man to withhold a subscription. If he can be persuaded that there is a doubt as to his subscription being turned aside to some other purpose, he will think about it and eventually withhold it. I really believe by acting upon this part of human nature we may have done a great deal that cannot appear in the Report. Think, for instance, how much money we may have stopped; and how many subscriptions which might have been given were not given to St. Albans Abbey and other places. St. Albans Abbey: from its magnificence and grandeur must interest everybody—myself especially—because unfortunately I was a subscriber. The subscribers were told that one fine tower was actually tumbling down, and afterwards that the south wall of the nave was insecure; well that was true, and large subscriptions poured in, the greater part of which was spent on very proper work, in putting these in order, but the remainder was spent in a very improper manner indeed, and when we complained of our subscriptions being diverted from the object we had given them for, we were told that the money we had subscribed had been spent on the work we wanted done, and that other people's money had been spent upon the rest: this remark reminds me very much of the story of a small dissenting farmer who, before church rates were abolished, did not wish that the ceremonies of a religion of which he did not approve should be sustained and paid for by his money: it was proved that a certain fund was given out of the church rates for the destruction of sparrows, and he was told, if

he liked, his few shillings should be given for the destruction of the sparrows, and that other people's rates would be applied to religious purposes. But you can't divide a fund in this way; it must be considered as a whole; and I am unfortunately responsible, as being a subscriber, to a certain degree for what has been done at St. Albans Abbey, and which I regret very much. I have been led away from the immediate words of the resolution to talk about St. Albans Abbey in which I have great interest. Unfortunately it cannot be quoted as a proof of the good work of this Society, whose efforts did not succeed, but in spite of this failure it is doing a good and useful work, and is deserving of your energetic support." (Cheers).

The Rev. STOPFORD BROOKE, M.A.:—"The resolution which I have to speak to is, 'that the work which the Society has carried out during the past year has been both important and useful, and that in the opinion of this meeting the Society is deserving of continued and energetic support.'

"It is a resolution I support on two grounds—first, the reverence due to the human sentiment and life which is embodied in a building, and secondly, the art embodied in it. When a great church was being set up in the old days, the whole countryside and all its folk were engaged in it, and spent their life and strength upon it. The villagers gave up one day in the week to the work. Some fetched stones from the hillside, others brought gravel from the brook. The knight who went to the

Holy Land thought of the Abbey Church when far away, and brought home a beautiful piece of marble or a rare gem to enrich its altars. The lady who wished and prayed for the return of her knight offered some of her jewels—even the old peasant left some money to assist the building. Lovers who wished their love happy, worked at its ornament; the wandering mason was employed by one who had done a great sin to carve a capital which should be an expiation, and express his repentance. There was a constant stream of human excitement in the monastery while the building drew towards completion; almost every stone was linked to some human love or human interest. In this way all the events of human life, century after century, were built up with each great cathedral, and even into the small village church. Each historical event that interested the country, each contest that excited the county town, were celebrated in these buildings. And the men who did the work wrought not only with the artist feeling, but inspired by this human feeling which encompassed them like a spirit. It is this humanity we feel when we enter a great cathedral, a village church, or a town hall in which political life has been for many years enshrined. Of those who enter the old churches, some are religious and are impressed with the religious life and feeling in them; others do not care for the religion, but they are impressed as much as those who are religious with the vast spirit of humanity which fills them like an incense from the past. Is there a single touch of that left when the place is once 'restored?' The whole of the old life, of

the old human interest, is taken from it, and the building when once restored has as much of the spirit of the old building as the *Iliad* in Pope's *Homer* has of the spirit and life of the original.

“ Another side of this human sentiment has to do with the lives of the great men who have given their thought and life to England. Their bones lie in the old church, their work has been done in the old town hall. We feel their presence in the buildings where they worshipped, where they spoke for liberty. ‘Restore’ these buildings, make them fresh, and we destroy a part of the life of the men ; we blot out all our own sentiment for them so far as it is bound up with the place ; we annihilate associations which never can be replaced. I did not much admire *Grasmere Church*, but when I saw the old pew in which *Wordsworth* had sat, and the seats where the *Dalesmen* had worshipped, whose lives he had told in poetry, I felt the presence of the poet in the place, and the spirit of the hills, and of the hillsmen's lives. Not a trace of that sentiment would have been left had the place, as the restorers wished, been done up new. It has been saved by the work of this Society, and to do things of that kind is a work of the highest usefulness, and worthy of the support of those who care for the interests of humanity. (Cheers). This year I went to see *Ann Hathaway's Cottage*. It is much the same as when *Shakspeare* courted there his love. I saw the old worm-eaten settle on which he sat, and the old fireplace where the farmer warmed himself while the lovers talked. Had the settle

been thrown away and a new one—a copy of the old—put in its place, where would have been my pleasure? And yet it is exactly that very kind of work which the ‘restorers’ are doing to all our old buildings and old churches all over the country. They are destroying all our poetic interest in the past. (Cheers).

“It is said with a sneer that this is a question of sentiment. So it is. (Hear, hear). It is said that restoration is necessary, and that the buildings must be fitted for modern uses. Yes, take care of the building, keep it from the weather, do not let the wind and the rain blow through it, prop up its walls when they need it, keep decay away as much as possible. That is the object of this Society—to preserve old buildings. But the work of ‘restorers’ is not to preserve, but to destroy; it is the exact contrary of our work. We keep the old building alive, but we do not touch the old work in which so much lies; they take the old work to pieces and make it all over afresh. The question of sentiment is nothing to them—it is everything to this Society. To support it, to keep these human feelings vivid, as one of the most useful means of education and culture we possess, is useful in our eyes, and more than useful, imperative. It is our greatest possession, this feeling of reverence and care for the work and the spirit of those who preceded us. (Hear, hear).

“The other ground for supporting the resolution is that of the preservation of art. Our beautiful buildings are beautiful because they were conceived by artists and



worked at by artists. Some of them were great, as the architect; some of them were less, as the carvers and masons, those who did the figures, those who did the capitals; but whether they were great or small, they all had that which makes the artist: invention, a certain creative and original energy—and they all felt that feeling for and love of what they did, that joy in their work whilst they were doing it, which makes the artist. The Architect himself toiled day and night at his work, every minute of his thought was invention, and to all his thoughts he gave his life; such love as the mother gives to her child, so much he gave to the child of his invention, and in the whole and in every detail, we see the character, the force, the living spirit of the artist. Others succeeded the first architect. These built in the decorative or the perpendicular style of architecture. Their work was however never restoration, but always creation. The old work was often destroyed, but it was never *redone*; there was always at least invention, pleasure in what was done, some human life and energy were put into it, the spirit of original thought was there. The smaller artists worked at the pavement, at the figures, at the painting; but all they did shines with the light of originality—you cannot mistake it; all of them created; each of the things they did is individual; in each of them we feel the love and joy with which the men worked; in each of them we see and touch a living character. In our faithful study and admiration of all this true art-work, lies half the art education of the

English people ; and that is surely useful and worthy of support.

“Take down the cathedral, the town hall, or the school house; build them up again; rechisel the capitals; make the windows new; carve all the figures in the doorway afresh; do the work the restorers are doing—and what is done? The Art of the building is absolutely blotted out. All that makes art is gone, drowned, dead for ever. Is there invention? There is nothing of it, only imitation. Is there love in the new work? We know there cannot be, for there is no creation. Is there any joy in the workman’s heart? How can there be; he is only a copyist. Neither he nor the architect can be called artists, nor can the work they do be art. As far as individual character is concerned, they are degraded by this mechanical restoring. As far as the growth of art is concerned, every restoration is burning up its roots. A restored church is like a repainted picture: the subject is there and the outline, but the soul, the light, the charm and character so inimitably treated, are gone—everything is gone of that which was once art. The building is as absolutely useless and unimportant as a great picture which has been painted over by a picture cleaner.

“All over England, for the last twenty years, art and its work is being thus destroyed, and the business of this Society is to save what is left. We hold that however much time and decay have set their mark upon pillar and capital and figures and doorway, there still remains, behind

the decay, the creative style, the love which wrought—the imagination and the soul of the artist; the fine spirit of human thought; the spirit of the pleasure and joy the builder and the carver had—and that to see and feel and rejoice in and reverence these things is for us education in beauty, is to learn what art is: and that to get that education and learning is of the greatest possible importance. We believe that to destroy these means to education is the greatest possible harm and the greatest possible evil (cheers); and as a side issue from this, we wish to train workmen to invent and not to imitate, to set them to new work; to invention; to use them no longer as machines to copy, but as men who have some chance of becoming creators. (Loud cheers).

“These are some of the grounds of our protest, and this is why we say, Better build a new building altogether than restore the old. To preserve a building is right, but to restore it wrong. This is common sense; this is worthy of continued and energetic support.”

Mr. FFYTCH, F.S.S., moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman for presiding over the Meeting. He took the opportunity of mentioning his action, in conjunction with Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, in purchasing the stones of St. Mildred's Church, Poultry, which were about to be carted away.

Mr. MOODY, of South Kensington, said he had much pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks.

The CHAIRMAN:—“I am much obliged to you for the vote of thanks which you have passed, and I am very

glad to see so full a hall. The attendance is very good, and shows an interest in the operations of this Society, which are rapidly extending, and for which support is required both in mind and subscription, as well as the infusion of fresh blood by addition of members.

“ I wish to allude to one circumstance of interest—the proposed demolition or reconstruction of London Bridge. The passing of the Act to give effect to this scheme has been again postponed, owing to the action of the House of Lords, and the threatened destruction has been again averted. It was saved last year through the intervention of the Treasury, and every one believed that the danger was then over. It has now been sent to a committee, and from that committee let us hope it will never return alive.” (Loud cheers).

# LIST OF MEMBERS.

---

## ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 10s. 6d.

---

\* These form the Committee.

† Local Correspondents.

- \*G. Aitchison, 150, *Harley Street, W.*  
\*W. C. Alexander, *Aubrey House, Kensington.*  
Mrs. Alexander, *Aubrey House, Kensington.*  
Wm. Allison, *The Firs, Louth, Lincolnshire.*  
Mrs. Anderson, 57, *Upper Berkeley Street, W.*  
Sir W. R. Anson, Bart., *All Souls', Oxford, and 39, Portland Place.*  
Rev. R. Green Armytage, 6, *Rothwell Street, Primrose Hill.*  
\*T. Armstrong, 121, *Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square.*  
Rev. S. Arnott, *The Vicarage, Turnham Green.*  
Job Ashton, *Champion Park, Denmark Hill.*  
J. E. Backhouse, *Harworth Grange, Darlington.*  
A. Baldwin, *Wilden House, Stourport.*  
\*Eustace Balfour, 32, *Addison Road, W.*  
Sutherland Banner, 24, *North John Street, Liverpool.*  
Rev. A. Barff, *Choir House, St. Paul's.*  
\*J. W. Barnes, *The Bank, Durham.*  
Mrs. Barnes, *Gilling Castle, York.*  
F. B. Barwell, 8, *Vicarage Lane, Kensington.*  
A. Bass, M.P., 101, *Eaton Square, S.W.*  
\*Rt. Hon. Earl of Bective, M.P., 8, *Hamilton Place, Piccadilly.*  
T. Hugh Bell, *Red Barns, Coatham, Redcar.*  
G. Nevitt Bennett, 12, *Hereford Gardens, W.*  
\*Rt. Hon. G. C. Bentinck, M.P., 3, *Grafton Street, W.*  
\*J. F. Bentley, 13, *John Street, Adelphi.*  
J. B. Bevan, *St. Mark's Square, Regent's Park.*

- E. Birchall, 2, *Park Place, Leeds.*  
 Rev. W. J. Blew, M.A., 16, *Warwick Gardens, Pall Mall East.*  
 Jas. L. Bowes, *Queen's Buildings, Dale Street, Liverpool.*  
 W. Bowman, *Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.*  
 \*G. P. Boyce, 33, *Glebe Place, Chelsea.*  
 Henry Bowman Brady, F.R.S., *Hillfield, Gateshead.*  
 \*H. W. Brewer, 28, *Portland Road, Notting Hill, W.*  
 †James Bromley, *The Homestead, Junction Lane, Latbom, near Ormskirk.*  
 \*Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, 1, *Manchester Square, W.*  
 Edwin Brough, *Leek, Staffordshire.*  
 W. S. Brough, *Leek, Staffordshire.*  
 \*James Bryce, 7, *Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.*  
 A. Burrell, 2, *Fermyn Street, S.W.*  
 \*F. W. Burton, F.S.A., 43, *Argyle Road, W.*  
 Mrs. Jos. Bush, *Codicote Lodge, Welwyn, Herts.*  
 Rev. F. Brisbane Butler, M.A., *Wanderers' Club.*  
 †John Bunney, *Fondamenta San Biagio 2143, Venice.*  
 \*Ingram Bywater, *Exeter College, Oxford.*  
 Rev. Donald Campbell, *Navestock Vicarage, Romford, Essex.*  
 G. F. Campfield, 2, *Myrtle Villas, Muswell Hill.*  
 \*Rt. Hon. Lord Carlingford, 7, *Carlton Gardens.*  
 \*Thomas Carlyle, 5, *Great Cheyne Row, Chelsea.*  
 \*J. Comyns Carr, 19, *Blandford Square, N.W.*  
 †Dr. Caulfield, *Queen's College, Cork.*  
 \*H. J. Chamberlain, 53, *Ann Street, Birmingham,*  
 Wm. Chambres, 4, *Dale Street, Liverpool.*  
 Henry Clark, *Exchange Buildings, Liverpool.*  
 John Willis Clark, 1, *Scroope Terrace, Cambridge.*  
 \*C. G. Clement, *St. James's Lodge, Storey's Gate.*  
 Monsieur Clément, *Paris.*  
 G. Clulow, 87, *Caversham Road, N.W.*  
 J. F. Collier, *Canning Street, Liverpool.*  
 †\*Professor S. Colvin, *Savile Club, S.W.*  
 \*Leonard Courtney, M.P., *Reform Club.*



- The Baroness Burdett-Coutts, *Highbgate.*
- \*Rt. Hon. Earl Cowper, K.G., 8, *Grosvenor Square, W., and Panshanger, Hertford.*
- †Joseph Crawhall, *Newcastle-on-Tyne.*
- Rev. M. Creighton, M.A., *Embleton Vicarage, Chatbill, Northumberland.*
- Miss Crowe, 17, *Cunningham Place, St. John's Wood.*
- P. A. Daniel, 6, *Gray's Inn Square, W.C.*
- \*Sir Geo. Webb Dasent, *Belgrave Mansions, S.W.*
- J. Davenport, *Malmesbury.*
- Rev. Gerald S. Davies, *Charterhouse, Godalming.*
- \*W. De Morgan, 11, *Great Cheyne Row, Chelsea.*
- Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., 76, *Sloane Street, S.W.*
- Frank Dillon, 13, *Upper Phillimore Gardens, W.*
- W. H. Dixon.
- Wm. D. Robinson Douglas, *Orchardton, Castle Douglas, N.B.*
- John Douglas, 6, *Abbey Square, Chester.*
- \*Richard Doyle, *Athenæum Club.*
- Miss Duckworth, *Sussex Lodge, Hyde Park Gate South.*
- W. Edis, 14, *Fitzroy Square, W.*
- Fredk. Edridge, *Croydon.*
- \*Edwin Edwards, 26, *Golden Square, W.*
- \*F. S. Ellis, 29, *New Bond Street, W.*
- \*Rev. Whitwell Elwin, *Bopton Rectory, Norwich.*
- Miss Escombe, *The Grove, Penshurst, Tunbridge.*
- W. Esson, *Merton College, Oxford.*
- W. Herbert Evans, *Forde Abbey, near Chard.*
- Miss Ewart, 3, *Morpeth Terrace, Victoria Street, S.W.*
- T. M. Fallow, *Chapel Allerton, Leeds.*
- \*C. J. Faulkner, *University College, Oxford.*
- Mrs. Fawcett, 51, *The Lawn, South Lambeth Road.*
- Rev. J. P. Fawthorpe, *Whitelands College, Chelsea, W.*
- †R. S. Ferguson, F.S.A., *Lowther Street, Carlisle.*
- Richard Fisher, *Hill Top, Midhurst, Surrey.*
- W. H. Fisk, 4, *North Villas, Camden Square, N.W.*

- E. Fitzgerald, *Little Grange, Woodbridge, Suffolk.*  
 Lady Fitzhardinge, *Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire.*  
 Isaac Fletcher, M.P., *Tarnbank, Cockermouth.*  
 \*Wickham Flower, 47, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea.*  
 William Flytche, F.S.A., *Thorpe Hall, Ethington, Lincolnshire,*  
*and 20, Chester Square, W.*  
 T. B. W. Forster, *Holt, Trowbridge, Wilts.*  
 Birkett Foster, *The Hill, Witley, Surrey.*  
 Rev. J. P. Foster, *The Vicarage, Dartmouth.*  
 T. Gairdner, *Public Record Office, Chancery Lane.*  
 Miss A. Garrett, 2, *Gower Street, W.C.*  
 \*Miss R. Garrett, 2, *Gower Street, W.C.*  
 John Giles, 29, *Albion Street, Hyde Park.*  
 W. Edgar Graham, 5, *St. Andrew's Place, Regent's Park.*  
 Edward Green, 47, *Upper Grosvenor Street.*  
 Prof. A. G. Greenhill, *Royal Artillery Institution, Woolwich.*  
 †\*Rev. Canon Greenwell, *Durham.*  
 Joseph Grimshire, 1, *Parkholme Road, Dalston.*  
 Dr. A. B. Grosart, *Park View, Blackburn, Lancashire.*  
 \*Hon. Norman Grosvenor, 35, *Park Street, Grosvenor Square.*  
 \*Hon. Richard C. Grosvenor, 35, *Park Street, Grosvenor Square.*  
 George Grove, 30, *Bedford Street, Strand, W.C.*  
 Sir William Gull, Bart., 74, *Brook Street, Grosvenor Square.*  
 †Chas. Hadfield, *Corn Exchange Chambers, Sheffield.*  
 Rev. John H. Hall, B.A., F.S.A., *Crawe Rectory, Market*  
*Harboro'.*  
 †T. H. Hall Caine, *Liverpool.*  
 Professor Hales, 1, *Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill.*  
 W. Matthew Hales, 4, *Manchester Street, Manchester Square.*  
 †Augustus J. C. Hare, *Holmburst, Hastings.*  
 Major Alfred Heales, *The Chimes, Streatham Common.*  
 J. Aldam Heaton, 29, *Bloomsbury Square.*  
 Miss Heaton, 6, *Woodhouse Square, Leeds.*  
 \*John Hebb, *Metropolitan Board of Works, Spring Gardens.*  
 Wm. Hebb, *Ross, Herefordshire.*

- Rev. Prebendary Hedgeland, *Penzance, Cornwall.*  
 Mrs. James Hemery, *Gladsmuir, Hadley, Barnet.*  
 John Henderson, M.A., F.S.A., 3, *Montague Street, Russell Square.*  
 \*J. P. Heseltine, 196, *Queen's Gate, S.W.*  
 E. Hicks, *Garrick Club.*  
 Gray Hill, *Water Street, Liverpool.*  
 A. J. Hipkins, 100, *Warwick Gardens, W.*  
 \*J. E. Hodgson, A.R.A., 5, *Hill Road, Abbey Road, St. John's Wood.*  
 †J. Stewart Hodgson, 8, *Bishopsgate Street, E.C., and Haslemere, Surrey.*  
 J. Holland, 57, *Lancaster Gate, Kensington Gardens.*  
 Professor T. E. Holland, *All Souls', Oxford.*  
 †\*James R. Holliday, 101, *Harborne Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 †John Honeyman, 140, *Bath Street, Glasgow.*  
 H. J. Hood, 2, *Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*  
 \*Rt. Hon. Lord Houghton, 6, *Clifford Street, W.*  
 \*George Howard, 1, *Palace Green, Kensington.*  
 \*Samuel Huggins, *Upper Eyarth Hall, near Ruthin, N. Wales.*  
 Arthur Hughes, *Wallington Bridge, Carshalton, Surrey.*  
 R. Tierney Hughes, 55, *Cornhill.*  
 Francis Hullah, 5, *Cornwall Residences, Clarence Gate.*  
 \*W. Holman Hunt, 7, *Berkeley Gardens, Campden Hill, W.*  
 \*A. W. Hunt, 1, *Tor Villas, Campden Hill, W.*  
 J. D. Hutchinson, M.P., *Birks Hall, Halifax, Yorkshire.*  
 Colin Hunter, *Lugar Lodge, Melbray Road, W.*  
 Rev. W. Hutchinson, *Howden Vicarage, E. Yorkshire.*  
 Edward Hutchinson, *The Elms, Darlington.*  
 L. A. Ionides, 16, *Holland Villas Road, Kensington.*  
 Jos. J. Jenkins, F.S.A., 67, *Hamilton Terrace, N.W.*  
 Rev. T. W. Jex-Blake, D.D., *School House, Rugby.*  
 \*E. Burne Jones, *The Grange, North End Road, Fulham.*  
 James Jones, 2, *Prospect Place, Upper Clapton.*  
 W. H. Hammond-Jones, *Witley, Surrey.*  
 \*Charles Keene, 4, *Queen's Road, Chelsea.*

- \*William Kenrick, *The Grove, Harborne Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*
- \*S. Wayland Kershaw, *The Library, Lambeth Palace.*  
 Lieut.-Col. V. A. King, *Point of Ayr, Oxton, Cheshire.*  
 C. P. Knight, *St. Andrew's Street, Tiverton.*  
 E. R. Lankester, *Exeter College, Oxford.*  
 Rev. P. N. Leaky, *Parracombe Rectory, Barnstaple.*  
 J. Leathart, *Brackendine, Gateshead.*
- †S. Leighton, M.P., *Sweeny Hall, Oswestry.*
- \*Charles G. Leland.  
 George Leslie, R.A., 8, *Grove End Road, N.W.*  
 Mrs. H. Leslie, *Longmead, Remenham Hill, Henley-on-Thames.*  
 Rafe O. Leicester, 6, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, and Toft, Knutsford, Cheshire.*  
 Wm. Linnell, *Hills Brough, Red Hill.*  
 W. E. H. Lecky, 38, *Onslow Gardens, South Kensington.*  
 R. B. Litchfield, 4, *Bryanston Street, Portman Square, W.*
- \*Rev. W. J. Loftie, 57, *Upper Berkeley Street, W.*  
 H. Longden, *Phoenix Foundry, Sheffield.*  
 W. H. D. Longstaffe, *Gateshead.*
- \*Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., *High Elms, Down, Beckenham, Kent.*  
 Henry Lucas, 46, *Gloucester Square, Hyde Park.*  
 Vernon Lushington, 21, *New Street, Spring Gardens.*
- †H. E. Luxmoore, *Eton College, Windsor.*
- \*Norman Maccoll, 18, *Manchester Street, Manchester Square.*  
 P. J. Mackeson, 33, *Addison Gardens, North Kensington.*
- \*Frederick Macmillan, 2, *Elm Tree Road, St. John's Wood, N.W.*  
 Dr. Macnamam, *Uxbridge.*  
 A. Mackey, *Trowbridge, Wilts.*  
 J. H. S. Mann, 2, *Camden Studios, 28a, Camden Street.*
- †Rev. Newton Mant, *The Parsonage, Sledmere, York.*  
 Alfred Marks, 52, *Cornhill, London, E.C., Honorary Treasurer.*
- \*H. Stacy Marks, R.A., 15, *Hamilton Terrace, St. John's Wood.*
- †J. H. Mayo, *Guildford, Surrey.*

- Jno. Henry Metcalfe, 28, *Well Walk, Hampstead.*  
 Edgar J. Meynell, *Durham.*  
 Henry Middleton, 4, *Storey's Gate, Westminster.*  
 J. E. Millais, R.A., 2, *Palace Gate, Kensington.*  
 \*A. B. Mitford, 100, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea.*  
 W. H. Monck, *Clapham Common.*  
 C. J. Monro, *Hadley, Barnet, Herts.*  
 \*F. W. Moody, 97, *Grosvenor Road.*  
 William Morris, 26, *Queen Square, Bloomsbury, London, W.C.,*  
 Honorary Secretary.  
 \*A. J. Mundella, M.P., 16, *Elvaston Place, Queen's Gate.*  
 C. Fairfax Murray, *Sienna, Tuscany,* Honorary Corresponding  
 Secretary for Italy.  
 Mrs. Newall, *Ferndene, Gateshead, Durham.*  
 Sydney J. Nicolle, *Cheque Bank, Pall Mall.*  
 †\*Rev. T. W. Norwood, F.G.S., *Wrenbury Vicarage, Nantwich.*  
 \*J. W. Oakes, A.R.A., *Leam House, Addison Road.*  
 Professor D. Oliver, F.R.S., *Royal Gardens, Kew.*  
 Rev. Geo. Ormsby, M.A., F.S.A., *Fishlake Vicarage, Doncaster.*  
 \*W. W. Oulless, A.R.A. 43, *Bloomsbury Square.*  
 Professor E. H. Palmer, *St. John's College, Cambridge.*  
 Lady Maude Parry, 24, *Upper Phillimore Place, Kensington, W.*  
 \*Coventry Patmore, *The Mansion, Hastings.*  
 \*Rev. Mark Pattison, *Lincoln College, Oxford.*  
 C. Kegan Paul, 1, *Paternoster Square, E.C.*  
 †Edward Peacock, *Bottesford Manor, Brigg, Lincolnshire.*  
 H. Pelham, 8, *Broadmore Road, Oxford.*  
 R. Kyrke Penson, F.S.A., *Dinham House, Ludlow.*  
 J. E. Mansel Pleydell, B.A., F.G.S., F.L.S., *Whatcombe, Blandford,*  
*Dorset.*  
 J. H. Pollen, 11, *Pembridge Crescent, W.*  
 T. W. Powell, *St. Catherine's, Guildford.*  
 Miss Powell, *St. Catherine's, Guildford.*  
 Henry Power, 37A, *Great Cumberland Place, Hyde Park, W.*  
 \*E. J. Poynter, R.A., 11, *Albert Terrace, Albert Gate.*



- Cormell Price, *United Service School, Westward Ho, North Devon.*  
 H. D. Pulford, 11, *Holland Villas Road, W.*  
 Horatio N. Pyne, 100, *Harley Street, W.*  
 George Rae, *Devonshire Road, Birkenhead.*  
 R. W. Raper, *Trinity College, Oxford.*  
 Philip Rathbone (*Messrs. Rathbone, Martin & Co.*), *Liverpool.*  
 \*G. W. Reid, *Keeper of the Prints, British Museum.*  
 Walter Rew, 17, *Bristol Gardens, Maida Hill.*  
 H. T. Richmond, 20, *York Street, Portman Square.*  
 J. Richmond, 20, *York Street, Portman Square.*  
 \*Professor W. B. Richmond, *Beavor Lodge, Hammersmith.*  
 \*Mrs. R. Thackeray-Ritchie.  
 Dr. Lloyd Roberts, 23, *Saint John's Street, Manchester.*  
 J. C. Robinson, 10, *York Place, Portman Square.*  
 T. W. A. Robinson, *Houghton-le-Spring, Durham.*  
 Vincent Robinson, 34, *Wigmore Street, W.*  
 \*E. R. Robson, *School Board for London, Victoria Embankment.*  
 Rev. Thomas Rogers, M.A., *The Grove, Durham.*  
 \*G. F. Rolph, 16, *Bedford Gardens, Campden Hill, Kensington.*  
 G. Freeth Roper, 4, *Garden Court, Temple.*  
 John W. Rose, *Old Hall, Reedham, Great Yarmouth.*  
 W. M. Rossetti, 56, *Euston Square, N.W.*  
 \*Professor John Ruskin, D.C.L., *Oxford.*  
 G. A. Sala, 46, *Mecklenburgh Square.*  
 Rev. A. H. Sayce, *Queen's College, Oxford.*  
 Sir Sibbald Scott, Bart., 18, *Cornwall Gardens, Queen's Gate.*  
 \*W. B. Scott, *Bellevue House, Chelsea.*  
 Rev. C. F. Seymour, *The Rectory, Winchfield, Hants.*  
 Henry Seymour, 91, *Victoria Street, S.W.*  
 J. Shand, 75, *Upper Ground Street, Blackfriars Road.*  
 J. Sidebotham, F.R.A.S., *Bowden, Cheshire.*  
 Richard Sisley, *Ockford House, Godalming.*  
 Mrs. Eustace Smith, 52, *Prince's Gate.*  
 F. W. Smith, F.S.A., 51, *Clapton Common, E.*  
 Professor W. Robertson Smith, 83, *Crown Street, Aberdeen.*



- \*Temple Soanes, *Pembury Grange, Tunbridge Wells.*  
     Hugh Stannus, 67, *George Street, Portman Square.*  
     Miss Julia Stapleton, *Remenham Hill, Henley-on-Thames.*
- \*Leslie Stephen, 13, *Hyde Park Gate South.*
- \*F. G. Stephens, 10, *The Terrace, Hammersmith, W.*  
     Darell Stephens, F.G.S., *St. Stephen's, Plympton, Devon.*  
     M. Stephenson, *Molesworth Cottage, Beverley, Yorks.*  
     Miss E. C. Stevenson, 13, *Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh.*  
     N. Stevenson, 51, *Wimpole Street.*  
     J. C. Stevenson, M.P., *Westoe, South Shields.*
- \*J. J. Stevenson, 3, *Bayswater Hill, W.*
- \*Rev. D. F. Stewart, 71, *Mornington Road, W.*  
     Marcus Stone, A.R.A., 1, *Langham Chambers, W.*  
     General Chas. Stuart, *Hoburne, Christchurch, Hants.*  
     W. Larnar Sugden, *Leek, Staffordshire.*
- \*L. Alma Tadema, A.R.A., *Townsend House, North Gate, Regent's Pk.*
- \*Rt. Hon. Lord Talbot de Malahide, F.R.S., F.S.A., F.G.S.,  
     F.R.G.S., 81, *Fermyn Street, S.W.*  
     Edward Taylor, *Hockerill, Bishop Stortford.*
- \*H. Virtue Tebbs, 1, *St. John's Gardens, Notting Hill.*  
     W. J. Thoms, F.S.A., 40, *St. George's Square, S.W.*
- †Mrs. Roby Thorpe, *The Park, Nottingham.*  
     Rev. Godfrey Thring, 18, *Kensington Gate, Hyde Park, W.*  
     J. R. Thursfield, 11, *Montague Place, Russell Square.*  
     Rev. A. Trower, *The Rectory, St. Mary-at-Hill, Eastcheap.*
- \*The Lord Bishop of Truro, *Kenwyn, Truro, Cornwall.*
- \*Stephen Tucker, Rouge Croix, *Herald's College, E.C*  
     G. I. F. Tupper, 19, *Champion Grove, Denmark Hill.*
- \*Rev. H. F. Turle, *The Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.*  
     Miss C. Turle, *The Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.*  
     W. H. Urwick, 34, *Great Tower Street, E.C.*  
     H. Vaughan 28, *Cumberland Terrace, Regent's Park.*
- \*Rev. Canon Venables, *The Precentory, Lincoln.*  
     Frederick Verney, *Devonshire Club, St. James's, S.W.*  
     Sir Harry Verney, Bart., 32, *South Street, Park Lane.*

- Rev. Hamilton Stewart Verschoyle, *Villa ae Angelis, Preno San Dominico, Fiesole Italy.*
- \*C. G. Vinall, 43, *Guilford Street, W.C.*
- Rev. H. Wace, 8, *Mecklenburgh Square.*
- J. L. Walker, 6, *Albany Courtyard, W.*
- †Rev. A. V. Walters, 5, *Upper High Street, Winchester.*
- R. E. Egerton-Warburton, *Arley Hall, Northwich, Cheshire.*
- J. Wardell, *Thorncliffe, Rathgar, Dublin.*
- \*G. Y. Wardle, 9, *Charlotte Street, Bedford Square.*
- †\*T. Wardle, *St. Edward Street, Leek.*
- G. C. Warr, *Holly Terrace, Hampstead.*
- G. F. Watts, R.A., *Little Holland House, Kensington.*
- T. W. Watts, 2, *Danes' Inn, Strand.*
- H. S. Webb, *Welwyn, Herts.*
- \*P. Webb, 1, *Raymond Buildings, Gray's Inn.*
- Thos. Wells, 14, *Manchester Square, W.*
- John Westlake, Q.C., LL.D., 16, *Oxford Square, W.*
- Denham Westmacott, 1, *Kensington Gate, W.*
- \*Rt. Hon. Earl of Wharnccliffe, *Wharnccliffe House, Curzon Street, W.*
- \*F. A. White, *Kinross House, Cromwell Road, N.W.*
- John Whitwell, M.P., *Kendal.*
- J. W. Whympster, *Haslemere.*
- †Rev. R. Y. Whytehead, *Nunkeeling Vicarage, Bewbolme, Hull.*
- James B. Williams, *Temple Club, Arundel Street, Strand.*
- Miss Williams, 9, *Porchester Square, W.*
- \*T. J. Willson, 3, *Southampton Street, Fitzroy Square.*
- Robert P. Wilson, 9, *Cumberland Terrace West.*
- Thos. T. Wing, 17, *Woburn Square, W.C.*
- \*A. Stuart Wortley, 6, *William Street, Knightsbridge.*
- Rev. Thomas Woodhouse, *The Vicarage, Ropley, Alresford, Hants.*
- H. Woolner, *Etruria Hall, Stoke-upon-Trent.*
- \*W. Aldis Wright, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- †\*Hon. Percy Wyndham, M.P., 44, *Belgrave Square.*
- Keith D. Young, 30, *Guilford Street, Russell Square, W.C.*

**S**ociety for the Protection  
of Ancient Buildings.

---

The Third Annual Meeting  
of the Society.

Report of the Committee  
thereat read.

---

28th JUNE, 1880.

---

NEWMAN MARKS,  
*Sec.*

### Committee.

G. AITCHISON.  
W C. ALEXANDER.  
T. ARMSTRONG.  
J. W. BARNES.  
Rt. Hon. EARL OF BECTIVE,  
M.P.  
J. F. BENTLEY.  
G. P. BOYCE.  
Dr. BIRDWOOD.  
H. W. BREWER.  
Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE.  
Prof. JAMES BRYCE, M.P.  
F. W. BURTON, F.S.A.  
INGRAM BYWATER.  
Rt. Hon. LORD CARLING-  
FORD.  
THOMAS CARLYLE.  
J. COMYNS CARR.  
H. J. CHAMBERLAIN.  
C. G. CLEMENT.  
Professor S. COLVIN.  
LEONARD COURTNEY, M.P.  
H. E. Earl COWPER, K.G.,  
*The Lord Lieut. of Ireland.*  
Sir GEO. WEBB DASENT.  
W. DE MORGAN.  
RICHARD DOYLE.  
F. S. ELLIS.  
Rev. WHITWELL ELWIN.  
C. J. FAULKNER.  
WICKHAM FLOWER.  
Miss R. GARRETT.  
Rev Canon GREENWELL.

Hon. N. GROSVENOR.  
Major ALFRED HEALES.  
JOHN HEBB.  
J. P. HESELTINE.  
J. E. HODGSON, A.R.A.  
J. R. HOLLIDAY.  
Rt. Hon. Lord HOUGHTON.  
GEO. HOWARD.  
SAMUEL HUGGINS.  
A. W. HUNT.  
W. HOLMAN HUNT.  
E. BURNE JONES.  
CHARLES KEENE.  
WM. KENRICK.  
S. WAYLAND KERSHAW,  
M.A.  
CHARLES G. LELAND.  
Rev. W. J. LOFTIE.  
Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart.,  
M.P.  
NORMAN MACCOLL.  
F. MACMILLAN.  
H. STACY MARKS, R.A.  
HENRY MIDDLETON.  
A. B. MITFORD.  
F. W. MOODY.  
Rt. Hon. A. J. MUNDELLA,  
M.P.  
Rev. T. W. NORWOOD, F.G.S.  
J. W. OAKES, A.R.A.  
W. W. OULESS, A.R.A.  
COVENTRY PATMORE.  
Rev. MARK PATTISON.

### *Committee.*

E. J. POYNTER, R.A.  
G. W. REID.  
Prof. W. B. RICHMOND.  
Mrs. R. THACKERAY RITCHIE  
E. R. ROBSON.  
G. F. ROLPH.  
JOHN RUSKIN.  
W. B. SCOTT.  
TEMPLE SOANES.  
L. STEPHEN.  
F. G. STEPHENS.  
J. J. STEVENSON.  
Rev. D. J. STEWART.  
L. ALMA TADEMA, R.A.  
Rt. Hon. Lord TALBOT DE  
MALAHIDE.  
H. VIRTUE TEBBS.

S. TUCKER, *Somerset  
Herald.*  
H. F. TURLE.  
Rev. CANON VENABLES.  
GEO. Y. WARDLE.  
T. WARDLE.  
P. WEBB.  
Rt. Hon. Earl of WHARN-  
CLIFFE.  
F. A. WHITE.  
T. J. WILLSON.  
A. STUART WORTLEY, M.P.  
W. ALDIS WRIGHT.  
Hon. PERCY WYNDHAM,  
M.P.  
Mons. CHAS. YRIARTE.  
Count ZORZI.

*(With power to add to their number.)*

### *Honorary Secretaries.*

WILLIAM MORRIS, 26, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, W.C.  
EUSTACE BALFOUR, 32, Addison Road, W.  
HON. R. C. GROSVENOR, 35, Park Street, Grosvenor Sq., W.  
C. G. VINALL, 43, Guildford Street, Russell Square, W.C.

### *Honorary Treasurer.*

ALFRED MARKS, 52, Cornhill, London, E.C.

### *Hon. Corresponding Secretary for Italy.*

C. FAIRFAX MURRAY, 108, Via Serregli, Florence.

### *Auditors.*

MESSRS. FULLER & WISE, 50, Gresham Street, London, E.C.

### *Secretary.*

NEWMAN MARKS, 9, Buckingham Street, Strand, W.C.



Local Correspondents.

*Birmingham*.—JAMES R. HOLLIDAY, Harborne Road, Edgbaston.

*Buckinghamshire*.—H. E. LUXMOORE, Eton College.

*Cambridge*.—Professor COLVIN, Trinity College.

*Cheshire*.—Rev. T. W. NORWOOD, Wrenbury Vicarage, Nantwich.

*Cumberland*.—R. S. FERGUSON, Lowther Street, Carlisle.

*Hampshire*.—Rev. A. V. WALTERS, 5, Upper High Street, Winchester.

*Lincolnshire*.—E. PEACOCK, Bottesford Manor, Brigg.

*Liverpool*.—T. H. HALL CAINE, 59, South Chester Street.

„ J. BROMLEY, Junction Lane, Latham, nr. Ormskirk.

*Northumberland*.—JOS. CRAWHALL, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

*Nottingham*.—Mrs. ROBY THORP, The Park.

*Shropshire*.—S. LEIGHTON, M.P., Sweeny Hall, Oswestry.

*Staffordshire*.—THOS. WARDLE, Leek.

*Surrey*.—J. H. MAYO, Guildford.

„ J. S. HODGSON, Haslemere.

*Sussex*.—AUG. J. C. HARE, Holmhurst, Hastings.

*Wiltshire*.—Hon. PERCY WYNDHAM, M.P., Salisbury.

„ J. DAVENPORT, Malmesbury.

*Yorkshire*.—C. HADFIELD, Sheffield.

„ Rev. N. MANT, The Parsonage, Sledmere, York.

„ Rev. R. Y. WHYTEHEAD, Nunkeeling Vicarage, Bewholme, Hull.

*Glasgow*.—J. HONEYMAN, 140, Bath Street.

*Cork*.—Dr. CAULFIELD, Queen's College.

*Venice, Italy*.—JOHN BUNNEY, Fondamenta San Biagio 2143.

*Rome*.—S. RUSSELL FORBES, 10 & 11, Piazza di Spagna.

*Paris*.—Mons. AD. GUILLON, 10, Boulevard de Clichy.



## Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.

---

*REPORT OF THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF  
THE SOCIETY, HELD IN THE HALL OF THE  
SOCIETY OF ARTS, JOHN STREET, ADELPHI,  
ON MONDAY, 28th JUNE, 1880. CHAIR TAKEN  
AT 3.30 p.m., BY STANLEY LEIGHTON, ESQ., M.P.*

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the meeting, said :—" We must all feel a touch of disappointment, which no one can feel more than myself, at the absence of the gentleman who was first asked to take the chair on this occasion—Mr. Ruskin. An address from Mr. Ruskin would have added, as we all know, a charm of poetry and sentiment to the report of our year's proceedings ; and words of his would have commended (I think in a way which no other words could commend) our labours to those who do not labour with us. Therefore, I feel that to-day, acting as his substitute, I am in need of the greatest forbearance from you.

" This Society has now existed for four years. It is the fourth year of its existence ; it has fairly fulfilled the expectations of those by whom it was founded. It

claims amongst its members men of Art, Science, Letters, Criticism, and men of business. It has filled a want, a recognised one, in the present state of society, for it has enabled isolated men, overwhelmed by a stupid majority of an uneducated neighbourhood, to appeal to an educated opinion, unfettered by prejudice, guided by men whose famous words and works have made them accepted leaders of thought in England. It is only by some such means and such combination that the few can defend themselves against the many.

“There are differences, of course, within the circle of our Association, but these differences are differences of degree and not of kind. Each and every one of us regrets, and it is by that common regret that we are bound, that many of the old landmarks of English history in this old England of ours are rapidly disappearing from the face of England; and this, not by the decay of time, but by the hand of man. Therefore, we repeat the protest that has been made before in the same words, which deserve frequent repetition, *‘that men should endeavour not to reproduce the old, which they cannot do, but that they should endeavour to preserve the old, which they can do.’*”

“I suppose that all of us, when we have been wandering through the streets of some old town in England, have felt regret at finding so little which is veritably old on which our eyes could rest. I suppose most of us have felt the same sort of disappointment when we have gone to an old country residence and found that on its

old site a quite modern structure has been erected. Now in the last century every country gentleman who had the means thought that it was part of his duty to pull down his old manor house or castle, and build a new one in its place. The grandsons are doing the same that their grandfathers did, and most of us may call to mind amongst the circle of our friends, instances where houses of the last century have been pulled down in order to put up a 'spick and span' house in the style of to-day.

"It is the wealth of the country, and not the poverty of the country, which enables men to do this, and it is fashion, rather than convenience or utility, which is the motive that induces them so to act. And yet we know that there does exist far and wide among the people of England a real love of what is old, though they do not exercise that love according to knowledge. How many instances do we know, of persons who have built a new house in the fashion of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, or after the fashion of Queen Anne, and have immediately set about to collect as much old furniture as they could to put into it. I would remind those persons that the furniture of a new house should be new furniture, and that there are artists in the present day who have not thought that furniture and decoration are beneath their consideration; there is workmanship now of as exquisite finish and design as any that in old days was made. I would also remind those that when a thing is taken from its old habitation and transported into another place it loses half the interest which belongs to it,

for it then becomes no part of the history of the place in which it is, but it becomes simply like a specimen in a catalogue or an example in a museum.

“Now, only the other day a gentleman bought an old black and white house in Shropshire, and he proceeded to pull it down and carry it into Berkshire, where he erected his false creation.

“Let me give you another example. The old collegiate church of Battlefield, near Shrewsbury, was erected to commemorate the Battle of Shrewsbury. In one of the windows of the church was a representation of the figure of a Shropshire Knight, Sandford by name, who was killed in the battle. This church some fifteen years ago underwent restoration, and a descendant of the knight, to his astonishment, on returning home from abroad, found packed up in his house the painted glass which represented his ancestor, and which had been removed from Battlefield to make place for the glass window of a more ecclesiastical character. I have seen the effigy of the knight and his arms, which belonged to the history of Battlefield Church, falsifying the history of the Sandford Chapel, in the parish of Press. But, ladies and gentlemen, it is monumental stones which suffer the greatest havoc in restoration. Let me give you an example. Some few years ago the church of Oswestry was restored at great cost: within the church there were no less than 170 monumental stones, stones which gave to a certain extent a local history of those who had lived and died in the parish from the time of Elizabeth

to the time of Queen Victoria. Mr. Street, the architect, buried every one of those 170 monumental stones in order that new encaustic tiles might be put in their place. I think if this Association had been in existence that this sacrilege might have been prevented. There was only one solitary person in the whole parish who protested against this spoliation; that man was looked upon as a fanatic. It is because we wish to protest against such spoliation that this Society exists, and increases in number and importance. We believe that in the architecture of England, its history is written from age to age, and we desire to hand down to those who may come after us that history in its continuity, without break or check. The stages, changes, and manners of society are written in chronological order in the buildings of this country. We know that new thoughts must supersede the old, but we do not think that the old ought altogether to be forgotten or blotted out."

The SECRETARY, on rising, stated that he had received upwards of 200 letters, expressing regret at not being able to attend the meeting, including letters from the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Wharnccliffe, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, the Rt. Hon. Sir C. Dilke, M.P., the Rt. Hon. Lord Carlingford, the Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella, M.P., Mr. W. Holman Hunt, Prof. Ruskin, Mr. E. J. Poynter, R.A., the Hon. Percy Wyndham, M.P., Mr. E. Burne Jones, Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., Mr. Leonard Courtney, M.P.



The CHAIRMAN then called upon W. Morris, Esq., the Honorary Secretary, to read the report.

Mr. MORRIS then read the following report :—

## ANNUAL REPORT.

THE work of the past year has differed little from that of the previous one, except in two notable instances, which will be referred to presently. The Committee have, as before, received information, written letters of enquiry, protest, and advice, sometimes with obvious and encouraging results, sometimes with nothing apparent to show for the trouble. The Society is, doubtless, becoming well known, and the Committee believe its principles are taking root, and especially, they think, are influencing the great body of our Architects; a course of events which is both very encouraging and what might have been expected.

The Society has by no means lacked the support of the Press during the past year; articles advocating its principles have been not unfrequent, and the columns of all the leading papers have been most generously thrown open to letters and explanations whenever necessary.

Nothing can be more hopeful than the fact that a Society having a similar aim to this has been set on foot in France, under the auspices of M. Guillon, an Honorary Member of this Society.

Before going further it may be well to quote a few of the most interesting cases in which the Society has taken action :—



CHESTERTON CHURCH, NEAR CAMBRIDGE.

Mr. Naylor, one of the Churchwardens, wrote to the Committee, asking them to use their influence in preventing the carrying out of a very damaging plan of so-called restoration which had been talked of. Mr. Basil Champneys hearing of this, very kindly offered to report on the Church; this report, a most careful and interesting document, being printed in the local papers, and extensively circulated, had the desired effect of putting a stop to the scheme of restoration.

ST. GERMAIN'S CATHEDRAL, ISLE OF MAN.

This Church, which forms part of the romantic and curiously interesting ruins on the Islet of Peel, is itself a complete ruin, though its dismantling is of comparatively recent date. This latter fact, doubtless, operated in pressing on a scheme for thoroughly restoring it, and making it the Cathedral Church of the Island. The Committee wrote a letter explaining their objections to the scheme to Mr. Gladstone, who on his visit to the Isle of Man had spoken in favour of the restoration; and later on the Honorary Secretary, being in the Island, had an opportunity of pressing the views of the Society both on the Governor and the Bishop. He found that several influential and intelligent people on the Island were by no means in favour of the scheme, and thought on the whole that opinion was against it; nothing has yet been done to carry it out, and the Committee have good hopes that it will be dropped.

ALDBOROUGH CHURCH, SUFFOLK.

The Committee did not hear of the proposed restoration of this Church until it was just about to be begun. Two Members of the Committee then viewed and reported upon it, and the Rector was written to on the subject, and as the result the scheme was greatly modified.

**PRESTBURY CHURCH.**

The attention of the Committee was called to this interesting Church by the Society's local correspondent in Staffordshire. The views of the Society were then placed before the Restoration Committee of the Church, a meeting of which a Member of this Committee was deputed to attend and explain those views more fully. Letters from Members of the Society were published in the local papers in answer to those who supported the restoration, and, in consequence, the opinions of some of the Restoration Committee were much altered, and the scheme of repair changed for the better.

**STUDLAND CHURCH, DORSETSHIRE.**

The Vicar and Churchwarden wrote to the Committee for advice as to this Church. The Committee sent down a Member to view the building and report upon it; it turned out to be a most interesting, though small Church, of Norman style, with a groined chancel, and was, in some respects, in a dangerous condition. An elaborate report was made, fortified with careful measured drawings, as to the practical means to be taken for preserving the Church from destruction, without subjecting it to restoration. This report was sent to the above authorities, who were quite in sympathy with the Society on the subject, and will form the basis of any work they undertake; so that the building may be considered to have been saved by the good sense of the Vicar and Churchwarden, aided by the work of the Committee.

The Society received information that it was projected to pull down five pre-Reformation Churches in Exeter for City improvements, by means of a short Bill in Parliament; but after some correspondence, in which

the Committee offered to do all in their power to oppose the scheme, the Committee heard that such strenuous opposition had been made to it, that it had fallen through.

#### MALMESBURY MARKET CROSS.

The Committee being informed that it was intended to restore this beautiful and curious monument, wrote to Lord Northwick, the owner of it, pointing out the dangers of restoration. They received a prompt and courteous letter from his Lordship, asking them to send some one down to confer with his agent there; on this two Members of the Committee went to Malmesbury, saw the agent, and drew up a careful report of the state of the Cross, showing what repairs were necessary, which was sent to Lord Northwick, and will, the Committee believe, be acted upon, and save the building (one of the best of its kind in England) from restoration.

Very elaborate and accurate drawings were made by the Members of the Committee while they were about this work.

#### THE OLD TOWN HALL, LEICESTER :—

A building which possesses some fine William and Mary carvings was threatened with demolition; but the Committee having taken action in the matter, it was saved—for the time, at least.

#### THE BAPTISTERY, RAVENNA.

This most curious and valuable building it is believed has sunk into the marshy ground on which it is built, and it has now been proposed by the Italian Government to lift it bodily some three feet. The whole interest in this building lies in its Mosaics, which are both early and beautiful. The danger to these from such a process is obvious; besides, the restorers do not intend to rest content with simply raising the building, but they propose

to extend their work and restore the decoration to the three feet of wall, which would be newly uncovered by this process, and this would sorely mar the genuineness of the whole monument. This little building seemed of so much importance to the Committee that they have ventured to address a letter of protest to the Italian Minister of Public Instruction and the Fine Arts, and are prepared, if necessary, to discuss the matter further.

#### ST. ALBAN'S CATHEDRAL.

Members will bear in mind the opposition which the Society has made, though in vain, to the scheme of the high-pitched roof, and the restoration, at the expense of the Freemasons, of the Western Porches. Sir Edmund Beckett having offered to rebuild the whole West front, the Committee saw no other course open to them but to make one last protest to save what was still left unrestored of the Abbey. They co-operated with Earl Cowper and Mr. John Evans in opposing the faculty which Sir Edmund Beckett was applying for in the Bishops' Court. The Committee regret to state that their opposition was unsuccessful, and that Sir Edmund Beckett has obtained his faculty; and though the Committee have been informed that an appeal lies to a higher Court, they do not think it advisable under the circumstances to carry the matter further. The Committee cannot refrain here from drawing the attention of the Society to the fact that no tribunal exists in this country before which any proposal for the alteration of a public and national monument can be dealt with, from the point of view of the effect such alteration may have upon it as a Work of Art or an historical monument.

This last is one of the two cases mentioned above in



which the Committee has undertaken work different in character to what usually lies before it. The other case is that of St. Mark's at Venice. In October last the Society received information from a correspondent that the west front of the Church, which had long been vaguely threatened with restoration, was now and immediately to be attacked and rebuilt. The Committee felt that, however delicate was the task of appealing to the Minister of a Foreign Country on such a subject, it had no choice but to act at once and vigorously in the matter. Therefore at a crowded meeting of the Committee it was resolved to memorialize the Italian Minister of Instruction, and the memorial was drawn up and offered for signatures, while members of the Committee attended meetings at Oxford, Birmingham, and elsewhere, which were held to protest against the rebuilding. These proceedings, as far as attracting both notice and sympathy in this country were concerned, were successful beyond the most sanguine anticipations. The memorial was signed by 2,000 names, including those of the most distinguished persons, by position, in the country, in statesmanship, literature, art, and science. The press discussed the matter in the amplest and most open way, and in short at home public opinion was thoroughly roused. Of course this could not fail to have its effect in Italy, where to a certain extent it was misunderstood, and supposed to indicate ill feeling towards that country: a supposition quite without foundation, we believe, and which the Committee guarded against from the first by the careful wording of all its communications. At any rate the movement excited so much attention in Italy that the Italian Ministry published, through the columns of the *Times*, what amounted to an official declaration on the subject, the purport of which was that

the information about the rebuilding was wrong; that the whole subject was already under reconsideration, and taken out of the hands of the local authorities to be lodged in that of the central Ministry; that it was generally understood how disastrous the last restoration—that of the South Front—had been; and that this one would be conducted in a different and less sweeping way. At first sight this statement seemed so satisfactory as to set the matter at rest for a long time to come, though the Committee's information had been both definite and from the most reliable sources. Subsequently, however, Mr. J. J. Stevenson, one of the Society's Members, Mr. Street, and other Architects visited St. Mark's and communicated with the Society. Mr. Street's letter, which he kindly allowed to be made public, appeared in the *Times*. Mr. Stevenson will address the Annual Meeting on the same subject; therefore all this Report need say further is, that experience abundantly confirms the views of this Society, that all restoration of the front is totally unnecessary. The Committee regret to have to add that it appears to be the present intention of the Government to carry out the restoration of the West Front by rebuilding it—a project which it was hoped they had finally abandoned, according to the terms of their communication to the *Times* already referred to.

**CITY CHURCHES.**—The Committee are glad to be able to inform the Society that none of these interesting buildings are at present threatened; the City Church and Churchyard Protection Society is doing good service in watching over their condition, and it is confidently hoped that public attention has been once for all roused to this important subject.



The Committee have also taken action in the under-mentioned cases :—

Pinner Church, Middlesex.  
Southwell Minster.  
Chideock Church, Dorset.  
Friskney Ch., Lincolnsh.  
St. Mary's, Truro.  
The Tower, St. Peter  
Mancroft, Norwich.  
Tewkesbury Abbey.  
Bamborough Castle, Dur-  
ham.  
Upton-on-Severn, Shrop-  
shire.  
Chapel - of - Ease, Tun-  
bridge Wells.  
St. Bartholomew's, Smith-  
field.  
The Fraternity, or Old Re-  
fectory, Carlisle.

Abinger Church.  
Egremont Church, Cum-  
berland.  
Easbey Abbey.  
Sion College, London  
Wall.  
Tisbury Church, Wiltsh.  
Hedon Church, Yorkshire.  
Preston Church, York-  
shire.  
The Iron Gates, Guildhall,  
Worcester.  
Elstow Church, Bedford-  
shire.  
St. Mary, Bury St.  
Edmunds, Suffolk.  
Old Houses, Petty Cury,  
Cambridge.

The Committee beg to call attention to the good service which their local correspondents have done. For example, Mr. Hadfield, at Sheffield, was successful in getting the old Font Cover at Rotherham Church replaced. Mr. Whytehead of Nunkeeling, near Hull, has been active in opposing the restoration of Hedon Church. And amongst others may be named, Mr. Ferguson of Carlisle, the Rev. A. V. Walters of Winchester, the Hon. Percy Wyndham, M.P., of Salisbury, and Mr. J. Davenport, of Malmesbury, as being very active in obtaining information for the Committee in their respective districts.

The Committee take this opportunity of reminding

Members that local correspondents are much needed by the Society, since it is not uncommon that, through the lack of them, news of proposed restorations reaches the Committee only after everything has been decided on, when it is practically too late to do anything more than make a protest.

The Committee have to announce that it has been thought desirable to add three Hon. Secretaries to the original one, the business of the Society being often very heavy and various. Mr. Eustace Balfour, the Hon. R. C. Grosvenor, and Mr. C. G. Vinall have consented to act in this capacity, which it is believed will expedite the despatch of business.

Members will note that the great activity of last year, especially that which took place about St. Mark's, when so much had to be done in a limited time, has burdened the resources of the Society heavily. The Committee therefore urge earnestly upon all Members the necessity of their using every endeavour to increase the numbers of the Society's subscribers, as the only means by which the resources of the Society can be steadily raised, and its influence efficiently secured.

N.B.—The Committee wish to draw special attention to the Publishing Fund which was started about two years ago by Mr. Coventry Patmore, but which has become a dead letter through want of funds. The Committee will look to the money that may be received for this fund to issue the Quarterly Reports, which, owing to the financial position of the Society, they have been unable to do up to the present time.

The CHAIRMAN then begged leave to call upon Lord Talbot de Malahide to move the adoption of the report.

LORD TALBOT DE MALAHIDE: "Ladies and Gentlemen,—I came quite unprepared to speak on the present

occasion, in fact it was very doubtful whether I should be able to attend at all. I am happy to be able to attend, and I so heartily concur in the protest of the Society, and approve of their conduct with reference to it, that I have no hesitation whatever in moving the adoption of the Report. For a long time I have held the opinion that what was called restoration has been doing an immense amount of mischief in the country. It is an unfortunate thing that a name which rather disposes people to view it favourably should mean in many cases vandalism. Our Chairman has mentioned so many instances in which injury has been done to public buildings through the want of some friendly interference, that it is needless for me to add to their number. I will only mention two cases which have lately come under my notice, which I mentioned at a previous meeting, but as perhaps many were not present at the meeting held in the City for the preservation of the City Churches, I may as well repeat what I said on that occasion. I was visiting a most interesting exhibition of the Archæological Society, and among the rest I saw two curious helmets of which the history is rather amusing. One of them, a very ancient helmet, had originally been hung over an old tomb in Hereford Cathedral, but some years ago, before people had their proper feelings on these matters, it was taken from the tomb and presented to the late Mr. Merrick, who was making a collection of armour, by the Dean and Chapter of Hereford. I am sure my old friend was incapable of such an act, and it must have taken place

before his time, and I should think hardly any Chapter in England would be inclined to follow this example. The other helmet was connected with a more recent case, it was a case of restoration of a church in Essex where there were a number of old and interesting monuments. This church was condemned to a *thorough restoration*, and in the course of restoration every latitude was given to the builder and contractor; I believe they took possession of the monuments: and the old helmet I am now referring to was considered of some value and was presented to a friend of the contractor, and is in that worthy's hands at present. Such is the history of that helmet: a most disgraceful instance of vandalism! and there are a great many similar instances that have happened in the country. I am sure we are very much indebted to the Society for their exertions with reference to St. Mark's. I am afraid there is not much chance of convincing the Italian Government. I have known so many instances in which they have shown a want of regard to public opinion, that I should not be surprised if they sacrificed St. Mark's. They have committed some more acts of vandalism at Florence in several cases in the churches there; and even in Rome many of their proceedings are very open to criticism. They have interfered with one of the most ancient objects of interest, the Appian Way, by building fortifications. They must copy everything that is done in France, and which from a political point of view is an absurdity. They have done a great deal of harm, both in this



Appian Way and also on the opposite side of the Tiber. They have destroyed some very interesting villas, and there is no saying what damage may yet be done. Then, with reference to Ravenna, there are a great many interesting monuments. There are two baptistries, one, I think it is the Orthodox—it is one of the two—contains mosaic pictures of Justinian and his wife. Both are very ancient and interesting monuments, and every friend to art would regret very much that they should receive any injury. I think I heard a report that something was going to be done to the tomb of Theoderic, one of the most curious buildings of Vienna. There is no saying how far people will go if they have money, and it is fortunate when financial embarrassments prevent their doing as much mischief as they would be disposed to do.

“I do not know that there is anything further for me to say. I think in Ireland there is no great danger of damage being done by restoration. We have not any money, so we are safe, for the Government is not likely to throw away money for this purpose.

“In conclusion, I beg to express how cordially I sympathise with the objects of this Society, and to move that the report be adopted.”

The CHAIRMAN: “I beg to call upon Professor S. Colvin, Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Cambridge, to second the report which has been moved by Lord Talbot de Malahide, F.R.S.”

Professor COLVIN: “I do not mean to second the

report in very long terms, because there are several interesting things which you are all waiting to hear. I speak of the paper by Mr. Stevenson, and, what has probably excited more public interest than any other part of the work of the Society, the protest in regard to St. Mark's at Venice. And there are several other items of business before us. So I shall confine my observations to a very few points indeed, and those points suggested by the report which has just been read.

"It is quite clear that the first pages of this report show, in a very modest way, cases which give us every encouragement in our work, and real progress which has been made during the course of the last year.

"It has been urged against us that we complain and protest, and that our complaints and protests are never attended to; in fact, that we have not succeeded in anything that we have taken in hand. I hold in my hand a book which may be familiar to some of you; it is written by a very energetic personage, who is much occupied with all kinds of buildings, especially ancient buildings, Sir Edmund Beckett. Well, Mr. Chairman, this Sir E. Beckett is fond of buildings in the same sense as the boy in one of George Eliot's novels was fond of animals—'fond,' that is, 'of throwing stones at them.' The distinguished person to whom I have alluded may be said to be fond of buildings in the sense that he is fond of pulling them about. The book contains some good practical advice, but it also contains a few remarks which are amusing, though barely fit for quotation.



Amongst other things, the author has classed us with anti-vaccinators, and states that we offer a spectacle of a Society that has not succeeded in one of its objects. But he as well as others may see in our report that not in one or two cases have we been successful, but in a dozen or more definite cases we have succeeded in a most satisfactory way during the last year. By our exertions we have restrained, altogether or partially, projected restorations, set on foot by the more or less rash and misguided efforts of people in several districts. In others we have been the means of modifying the opinions entertained in the neighbourhood where such things were intended, in a manner which will not be without fruitful results when further questions of similar importance arise. Besides definite cases which might be quoted in the way of restorations projected and afterwards given up on representations of the Society, there is a great deal of practical influence which cannot find its way into the report, but the effect of which our children and their offspring will perhaps witness in the future.

“As you, Mr. Chairman, have already said, it used to be the fashion in the last century for a country gentleman to sweep away his Gothic or Elizabethan house, and erect a new building or palace in the French-classic style of Louis XV. Since then it has been the fashion to sweep away the French-classic palaces, and build again in the Gothic style of the thirteenth or fourteenth or some imaginary century of the middle ages. But we have awakened a change of feeling throughout the country,

and the fact that we are called all manner of names in some quarters has furthered this change by bringing us more prominently into notice. Thus our views have become better known and more widespread, and it is not yet fully possible to gauge the change that has taken place through our agency in the minds of the people of this country. People are learning not only to regard old buildings with reverence, but also the furniture and fittings of old buildings; and as at one time it was thought but right and natural to alter and pull about chimney-pieces, window mullions, and cornices, it is now fortunately becoming the fashion to take a pride in the unchanged character of such things, and to keep them as they are. Instead of a host taking his guests over his country house and showing them with pride the last new improvement he has succeeded in making upon his old possessions, he is beginning to feel a pride in taking his guest about the house and showing him whatever scraps remain *unimproved*, in the modern sense of improvement. These are some of the results which cannot appear on the face of this report, but which are none the less solid and lasting.

“There is a point mentioned further on in the report, just before the passage about St. Mark’s, which when it was read you received with great applause, and that was that some kind of tribunal is necessary and should be instituted, before which any alteration to any public or national monument that should be meditated might be brought. We might by such means be able to save

many a work of art, and many an interesting and historical relic. But this is too large a question to be adequately discussed at a meeting of this kind, and the creation of such a State tribunal is a thing so contrary to English habits that a great deal of thinking and scheming would be necessary before its adoption in this country. But it is none the less desirable that there should be some competent authority where matters of this kind could be referred to and be practically settled. We already know that a distinguished M.P., Sir John Lubbock, has proposed a measure going a certain length in this direction for the protection of a special class of antiquarian monuments in this country; it may not be rash to suppose that gradually, as the feeling which we embody in reference to the treatment of ancient buildings, propagates itself and gains ground, the idea of such a tribunal may in some form or other become consistent with English ideas, and by-and-by take a practical shape. However, that point is too large for me to dwell upon at a meeting of this kind; it is sufficient to throw out a hint upon it.

“There are a great number of points in the report which I should like to say a few words upon if time permitted, but I will only mention one or two more. There is one paragraph relating to the work of local correspondents, especially that clause which speaks of information received *too late* for us to take action upon.

“We frequently receive information when everything is settled: and that brings home to my mind a case with

respect to a particular building of great interest, to which I was invited at such a stage mentioned in the report. There is, not far from Worksop, in Nottinghamshire, a little ruined chancel and nave; it is one of the prettiest fragments of a Romanesque or Norman church in England. The ruin was overgrown with ivy; but the chancel, with its groining and carvings, was almost entirely intact: it was surrounded by trees and had that charm, that sanctity, which is peculiar to ruins, and which we must acknowledge to be in its manner as worthy of our respect as the charm and sanctity of any building in actual service. Do not let it be said that we undervalue the practical use of buildings, or that we wish to keep them in a state of disrepair when proper repair would put them into a state fit for use: but let it be understood that we acknowledge the difference between buildings which can be reasonably made fit for use, and buildings like the one that I am speaking of, which the course of its history has already brought to the conditions of a ruin, and which cannot be made fit for use without transformation. I say then that the duty of friends to this place, would be to keep it as it is, and hand it down to posterity as a relic of a past age, and a landmark of English history. But my friend, the incumbent, had already begun to renew it for use by a new mining population close by. If we had received information of this at first, we should have suggested two things, the building of a new church, and the preservation of the ruin; then, instead of having that which is neither one



thing nor the other, the population would have had both a new church according to their requirements, and a ruin which would be the delight of every lover of history.

“Cases of this kind are very numerous, but the principles which we wish to inculcate on the public, if they were better known, would bring about a better state of things.

“I will not detain you any longer, but will with pleasure second the resolution moved by Lord Talbot de Malahide, F.R.S., for the adoption of the Report.”

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Professor Hales to speak to the motion.

Mr. HALES: “Mr. Chairman, my Lord, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I have very great pleasure in supporting this motion. When one hears of ‘the protection of old buildings,’ or of anything, one naturally asks the question, From what and from whom are they to be protected? And the melancholy answer in the present case is certainly this—The buildings are to be protected from their friends. It has been well said, as we know, by an old French Marshal, that he could protect himself very well from his enemies, but would heaven protect him from his friends. And that is the special danger to which these buildings are subject at the present time. And in order to understand that, one should notice that in the present day there is a reaction against the old feeling of indifference and neglect of these buildings which naturally may take a very extreme shape. In the last

century and the century before, it was the period of demolition or of pure neglect. I am afraid, as our Chairman has already shown us, that the age of demolition has not yet passed away; but this spirit does not rage to the same unrestrained and unfettered extent which one finds in the last century and the century before. There is a passage, a very short one, if I may read it, which occurs in a book issued this year by the Camden Society, which probably very few have yet seen. It is a very curious address by the Bishop of Norwich on behalf of funds for the restoration or the reparation of St. Paul's Cathedral which had been damaged long before the Great Fire. He says: 'Some petitions have I had since my coming to this diocese for the pulling down of such an aisle, or for changing lead to thatch. So far from reparations, that our suit' (*i.e.* the suit to us) 'is to demolish. Let me order it for the best by myself or by my chancellor; yet nothing done, or very slightly. Nay, men are taught 'tis persecution, and wisht to look to their religion, knowing not how they commend Popery. If such alterations bring it in, if to repair Churches be to innovate, I am of that religion.' He goes on to say that in all endeavours to preserve the old buildings the churchwardens murmured at his visitation. They did not actually use the same words, but seemed to address him like those foul spirits in the Gospel: 'What have we to do with thee, thou Bishop or thou Chancellor; art thou come before thy time, before all is down, to torment us.' The truth went once in this phrase, 'The



zeal of thine house hath eaten up my bones ; 'tis now inverted, My zeal hath eaten up thy house. 'Tis English, plain enough, and needs no construing.' It is a positive fact that about the end of the last century, in the year 1796, the chapter house of Durham Cathedral, which was, I believe, a unique specimen, was permitted to fall into decay, and the Canons permitted it to perish. Another appalling fact is that the Galilee of Durham Cathedral, a rare specimen of exquisite beauty, was to have been moved in order to make it more convenient for the Prebendaries to drive down to the river from the Cathedral precincts. That iniquity was prevented by the Society of Antiquaries, which did at that time what our Society is now trying to do. But nowadays, it is not demolition so much that we have to protest against as against this spirit of restoration, in fact the word *restore* is getting to be a very suspicious word ; it is becoming a kind of euphemism for *destroy*. The kind of restoration that is found perpetrated at these churches reminds one very much, I have thought, of the restoration of Peleas in the old Greek Mythology. He was old and feeble, and his daughters were to restore him by cutting him up in pieces and boiling him. The example is not altogether satisfactory. In our own time the so-called restoration produces the same results—the life of a building is perpetually slain, and the mere corpse is left for us.

“ But it is as a student of English literature that I wish to say to-day, in expressing my sympathy with this

Society, how important it is to keep these buildings in their old form. For some centuries these old buildings of ours, of such infinite value, are indeed the best expressions of the English mind in its highest form. It is so for instance in the thirteenth century. There is nothing in English literature to compare with the exquisite expression that is given to the thought of that period by the Cathedrals of the century; and in later times, when we had the great masterpieces of English literature, the coeval buildings are of scarcely less value in the way of illustration. It is impossible to say of how great value a visit to these old buildings is to an earnest student of literature of the same period. And apart from that question the associations of these old buildings are of vital value to the true student of literature. These associations are of such a kind that they are easily disturbed and banished. The *genius loci* is a very sensitive spirit, very easily driven away, and in some of these old churches this seems being done. In order to be definite I will refer to one church in England, the damage done to which has been a grave loss to the study of English literature. I mean the church, exquisite even in its present mutilated condition, of St. Saviour in Southwark. As far as mere beauty is concerned—but that is not the point I am speaking of—I say so far as mere beauty is concerned, there could scarcely have been in London before the Fire a church of greater beauty than that of St. Saviour. But what especially concerns me is the famous literary connections with that church. It is a fact that

will speak volumes to many of us that a brother of Shakspeare is buried in that church, and that many great contemporaries and fellow writers of Shakspeare are buried there. John Fletcher is buried there, one of the most brilliant dramatic lights next to Shakspeare, and Massinger, and Shakspeare's fellow actor Lawrence Fletcher, and Henslow, a man very well known in the early history of the drama, and Sir Edward Dyer, a man of great importance and influence in his circle and time. Now, Sir, I say that the outrage done to that church has inflicted a serious loss on the local associations of certainly some of our greatest English writers, and it was only in the year 1840, nearly 40 years ago, that the nave of this church was pulled down. Another church rises to my mind at this moment, a church connected with Milton, the church of Horton, near Windsor, where Milton wrote most of his early poems. This church has been restored and renovated so that all memory of the past seems obliterated. It is a great desire with many people now to scrape these old buildings and remove from them every vestige of the past, and that has been the case with this church at Horton. I may mention that there is still an old cottage standing in Chalfont St. Giles which is the last house now standing in England that can be connected with Milton. His last standing residence in London was pulled down last year, but there is still this cottage standing in which we first hear of 'Paradise Lost' completed, and in which, probably 'Paradise Regained'

was partly written. It would be a very good work if someone would undertake the protection of that place.

“We seem to be now much in the same condition with regard to our public buildings that people were with regard to our old writers in the last century. It was a very common thing then not to be content with the old books, but to rearrange them in a very liberal way, so that the original either disappeared underneath the many emendations, or was so altered as to be unrecognisable. That seems exactly the case in the matter of restoration in many places. These restorers are very well-meaning, and what they wish to bring about in these buildings is a certain consistency, a certain unity; a very good aim in itself, but it is an aim which is to be regulated by the circumstances of the case. It will be just as great a mistake to sweep away what seem to be excrescences, and make these old buildings exhibit a unity of design, as it would be to lop away what seem the excrescent parts of Shakspeare. That is what the public did in the last century, and that is what people are doing with regard to our old public buildings. We find that there has come a change in public opinion respecting literature, and at the present day we do not accept the versions or perversions of the literature of old England which the last century abounded in; there is at the present day an increasing desire to reproduce Shakspeare as exactly as possible in his original shape. We allow that there may be misprints: there must be repairs; but we insist that



these repairs should not be carried out in a wanton, interfering, and superfluous manner.

"There is just one special point in the report which I shall have the pleasure to refer to before sitting down. With reference to St. Germain's Cathedral, as Mr. Morris has said, the restoration scheme has had a somewhat chequered career; it sometimes seemed in favour, sometimes dropping out of favour. I am glad now to announce, Sir, that it has definitely fallen through.

"It is quite certain that there are no more precious legacies than these old cathedrals and buildings that time has left us, and that it is one of the offices of real intelligent zeal to hand these legacies on to posterity."

The report was submitted to the meeting, and carried unanimously. The Chairman then called upon Mr. J. J. Stevenson, F.R.I.B.A., to read his paper on St. Mark's Church at Venice, in Italy.

Mr. STEVENSON, in lieu of a paper, gave a short account of the action of the Society on hearing of the proposed restoration of St. Mark's. When they first heard of the proposed restoration they did not know the state of the building. At the meeting at Oxford, Mr. Street stated that he had no doubt of the stability of the structure when he had seen it some years before; the Society thereupon in their petition, could only state that though they were not then in the position to give a definite opinion, yet they believed if it was threatened by destruction that it was in the power of science to ensure its stability without moving a single stone.



It was therefore important to know whether the west front of the Cathedral was in danger or not. The Society, upon hearing that the speaker (Mr. Stevenson) was going abroad in December, asked him to report as to the stability of the walls. He therefore spent several days at Venice, and examined the church; and the conclusion he had come to was this:—that the walls were perfectly safe, that there was not the slightest danger of their falling; but that the marble facing slabs were slightly in disrepair; the copper or iron fastenings which had pinned them to the walls had decayed; parts of the mosaics had been allowed to fall out; but the columns were still perpendicular, excepting those next the new work of the south front which had to be supported with wooden props. Their dangerous appearance alarmed some people so that they have written urging it as one of the main reasons for rebuilding the whole of the church, but it was caused merely by the wall to which they had been attached having been taken down, and the architect not having fixed them in any other way.

It was highly satisfactory to him that the conclusion he had arrived at, in respect to the stability of the Church, was the same as that of Mr. Street, who went out specially to examine it; and, further, their opinion was borne out by the architect of the building himself. In a letter in the *Times*, from the *Times* Correspondent, from information derived from the architect, it was stated that there was no fear as regards the stability of the building, and that no *rebuilding* of it was contemplated.

We may take it for granted then that the old brickwork of the church is safe and sound, but notwithstanding, it was evidently the intention to renew the whole front, Mr. Street has pointed out in a letter, which he kindly allowed them to publish, that the new work in connection with the old was about six inches higher than the old, and about six inches forward from it, and that the front of the building was not in a straight line, the centre being about one foot farther back than its ends. If then the lines and bevells of the new work are carried across the front, every part of the surface must come down; each stone or mosaic was to be removed, repaired, or scraped, and then put up again. This is much as if one said that a picture was in good condition, that the canvas was sound, that all that was wanted was to scrape it and repaint it.

The notions of the architect as to what was the proper mode of restoring such a building, were very different from theirs, from the views of the Society, but he did not think that the architect was to be specially blamed for this, as the same views were held by a great number of our English architects.

Things had been done and were now doing in England, that are not only as bad, but worse, than this proposed rebuilding of St. Mark's. For his own part he could not see the difference between the pulling down and rebuilding the west front of St. Mark's, and the pulling down and rebuilding the west front of St. Alban's Cathedral. It was true that St. Mark's was rich in colour and gold,

whilst St. Alban's was of grey English stone, but both were of historical value as characteristic specimens of the architecture of their countries. The alteration of St. Alban's was even worse than that of St. Mark's, because they did their best in its restoration to keep to the old form, but the front of St. Alban's is to be wholly rebuilt from a new design by Sir Edmund Beckett.

He would only add a few words as to the manner in which the restoration of St. Mark's had been hitherto carried out. In the old work which still remains, the lines were irregular, the marble facing in small pieces, so disposed that the marking on them formed a diagonal pattern; these slabs are attached to the brickwork by metal nails. In the new work the lines are straight, the curves and angles mathematically correct, the marble slabs in long lengths, fastened at top and bottom, so that no metal nails are visible. It is better building, but the beauty and charm of the old work, the rich colour and mellow tones, are gone. The new marble is cold grey, with darker perpendicular streaks as if dirty water had trickled down it. It has been left unpolished with the view of allowing it to tone more quickly, but it is possible this may render it liable to decay from the salt sea air of Venice.

He ventured to think he had proved from his own observation, from Mr. Street's, and from the architect of the building himself, that the west front of St. Mark's is in a perfectly safe condition; and further, that the scheme of restoration and repair which

it had been intended to carry out would completely destroy it. He therefore begged to propose this resolution :—

*“ That this meeting, having noted the opinions of Mr. J. J. Stevenson, Mr. G. E. Street, R.A., and other architects, who have recently visited St. Mark’s at Venice, is convinced that the west front is, on the whole, in good repair, and most earnestly deprecates any restoration of it.”*

And *“ That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts in Italy.”*

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. W. B. Richmond, Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford, to second the resolution.

Mr. RICHMOND : “ At this late hour of the meeting I shall refrain from offering you any remarks of my own, more than those which are necessary to elucidate the meaning of some letters which I have received from Venice in relation to this subject of St. Mark’s.

“ A short time ago I wrote to two friends of mine in Venice, who are distinguished artists, and asked them to forward me whatever information they could concerning the work that was being done and what was proposed to be done to St. Mark’s, and in some sense the answers which I have received are reassuring and refreshing to us. What has been done appears to be in the artistic circles universally regretted, they deplore beyond

measure that the scheme of restoring St. Mark's should have been started at all, and they hope that nothing further will be done to the building than is absolutely necessary to keep it from tumbling down. Those who hold these views are in the minority, but I am informed that they look forward with interest to the proceedings of this Society, because it exerts an enormous amount of influence over their artistic circle, which is at present in the minority, and they are most desirous that we should by our endeavours back up their minority. It is difficult for a minority to fight against a majority, and it is difficult for the cultivated opinion of the few to influence the opinions of an overwhelming majority without the aid of such a Society like our own.

“I will now read to you what an artist friend wrote to me concerning what has been done :—‘The work of reparation is quietly going on, for about a month there has been an open movable scaffolding in front of St. Mark's, so that the whole surface undergoes a careful examination, and parts of it are scraped or rivetted as circumstances may require.’ Now that is really reassuring to us, but I do not think it should stop us from backing up the minority in protesting that no further alteration shall take place which is not essentially necessary. My friend further says, ‘there is no doubt that it was owing to the voice of this Society, raised here in England, at the meetings held at Oxford, &c.’ (I must say, for my own part, to the exertions which Mr. Morris especially made, for nothing more disinterested



and more courageous can well be imagined), 'that the change of opinion, public opinion, was due.' He says he thinks the change comes from the distant growling of the British Lion, and that the British Lion had better continue to growl, as the people in Venice required to be urged to understand that their buildings are valuable, as they possess the idea that everything that is new is valuable and everything old is worthless.

"I have another letter to read, but first of all I will read to you what an Italian antiquarian writes concerning St. Mark's. He says: 'The article of Mr. Morris came at the right time; it was so full of fire, and hit the mark exactly. I published it in the *Rinnovamento*. This article was followed by the remarks and letters and accounts of meetings at Oxford and other places in England, published in the *Daily News* and *Times*. I took care that copies of these papers should find their way into the hands of those who had a vote in the Council, or had influence amongst its members. And when the Bill for the Restoration of St. Mark's was brought forward the influence of those pamphlets became manifest, for when the result of the commission to inquire into its restoration became known in Venice there was great rejoicing, for the alteration to the west front was rejected; the foundations were not to be demolished, as they were considered to be in a satisfactory condition; the marbles and columns were not to be polished and scraped to make them appear new; where the loosened marble threatened to fall it will be fastened by good

cement, and where the mosaics are kept with difficulty in their place, especially in the pavement, they will be repaired, not restored, and the delicate undulations, whether formed by design or accident, will not disappear.'

"The writer of the letter further says, that although our enemies here lowered their standard, they have still to fight against further restorations being made, they therefore appeal to this Society for help, so that by our public meetings we shall not allow the Italian zeal to cool.

"Now, in regard to the last letter, I have one more remark to make; the letter is from another friend in Venice, concerning the removal of that beautiful fountain in the North Square of St. Marks, the fountain of the Leoncini. They are going to remove this, and put in its place a statue of Victor Emmanuel. No one would object to the statue being placed in a prominent position, but we do object to an ancient monument, an ancient well, being taken away to give place to a modern work—a statue of a king. There are heaps of places in Venice which this statue would adorn with propriety. Now it appears that the artistic circles are extremely anxious to be backed up in this matter; not only the artistic clubs in Venice, but the sculptor of the statue himself objects to the site, and he is most anxious and desirous that they should be backed up to prevent this site being chosen for the statue. Now I think, ladies and gentlemen, we ought to say a word against the demoli-

tion of this well, and the placing of a statue of Victor Emmanuel in its place. As we have got the thin edge of the wedge in, I do not see why we should not drive it further home. Therefore I beg most heartily to second the resolution that we make further application to the Italian Government."

The CHAIRMAN stated that the resolution had been duly proposed and seconded, and he therefore put it to the meeting. It was carried *nem. con.*

Mr. HOWARD, a member of the Council of the Society, then rose and said:—"I have been asked to propose a motion which I am sure will be carried with acclamation by us all. It is that we should give a hearty vote of thanks to our Chairman. I have expressed an opinion which is a universal one, that this has been a most satisfactory meeting. As an old member of this Society, I thought there was hardly anything fresh to be said on the subject, but the meeting shows that I was completely wrong; it has shown us not only that there were fresh things to be said, but some fresh things to be done. We were not only educating public opinion, but we were really saving some ancient monuments. Now, I think that the business which took place at the latter part of the meeting about St. Mark's has been most satisfactory. It would have been unfortunate if we had given up our attempt to do good, even though we could not do all the good that some of us had hoped. I hope that the noble lord sitting next to me (Lord Talbot de Malahide) will excuse me if I say that the way to do that good is not by

abusing the Italian Government—because when we look at the action of our own Government when entrusted with the preservation of ancient monuments, we find they have done the same kind of thing. Look at what was done by the Government of the Pope in the churches of the Romagna; see what was done by Austria in Venice, and by the Empire in France; what the rule of *culture* has done at Oxford and Cambridge; what has been done in our own cathedrals under the rule of the Church of England; and even if we were to go to Ireland we should find that the student who desired to learn something of the spirit of history in the manner so eloquently described by Professor Hales, would have but little material left him in Christ Church Cathedral. So I believe the best thing for us to do is not to take a high position and censure the Italian Government, but to go to it, as lovers of the *old and beautiful*, and plead the cause of St. Mark's, so that it may still remain as it is—a treasure of historic interest and beauty. I shall say no more, but move that a hearty vote of thanks be given to Mr. Leighton for so ably presiding at this meeting."

Mr. EUSTACE BALFOUR :—"In seconding this vote of thanks to our Chairman, I think we may congratulate ourselves upon the success of this meeting, which is largely due to him for so ably presiding.

"I think, in spite of the success which we have achieved, we ought to bear in mind that we are in a small minority, and form but a small mass of opinion in

England and on the Continent, and that in fighting our way we should recollect that the preservation of every work of art is worth some sacrifice, not only for its own sake, but also for the dissemination of the principles for which we exist as a Society. I therefore, in conclusion, second the vote of thanks to the Chairman, to which, I feel sure, you will all heartily respond."

LORD TALBOT DE MALAHIDE :—"I rise to support the motion. In reference to the remarks of a late speaker, I think it my duty to mention that I was only complaining of the action of the Italian Government when they were acting contrary to feelings of good taste. I might say we ought to pass a vote of thanks to that Government for not changing the names of the streets in Venice."

The SECRETARY then put the vote of thanks to the meeting, which was carried unanimously, and graciously accepted by the Chairman.



# SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS.

Dr.

## Statement of Receipts and Payments for the Years 1877, 1878, 1879.

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS:—		By PAYMENTS DURING THE YEAR 1877:—	
Received during the year 1877	172 14 6	Printing and Advertisements	53 13 9
" " 1878	222 12 0	Office Expenses and Postages	17 13 9
" " 1879	200 10 6		
	595 17 0	By PAYMENTS DURING THE YEAR 1878:—	
		Printing and Advertisements	66 0 3
		Office Expenses and Postages	27 9 0
		Furniture for Office	20 8 0
		Travelling Expenses	13 17 8
		Secretary's Salary	124 8 0
			232 2 11
		By PAYMENTS DURING THE YEAR 1879:—	
		Printing and Advertisements	63 8 10
		Office Expenses and Postages	35 1 9
		Furniture for Office	4 0 3
		Travelling Expenses	7 13 8
		Secretary's Salary	120 0 0
		Hire of Willis's Rooms	5 5 0
		Rent of Office	20 0 0
			255 9 9
		By BALANCE AT THE 31st DECEMBER, 1879:—	
		Cash at Central Bank	21 12 0
		Less due to Secretary for Sundry Payments made by him	4 14 11
			16 17 1
			£595 17 0

It is estimated by the Secretary that the debts due by the Society at the 31st December, 1879 (including £40 advanced by Mr. Morris 10 St. Mark's, Venice) amounted to £137 12s., and that the arrears of Subscriptions due from Members at the same date amounted to £61 19s. FULLER & WISE, Auditors.

# LIST OF MEMBERS.

---

## ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 10s. 6d.

---

\* These form the Committee.

† Local Correspondents.

- A. C. Ainger, M.A., *Eton College*.  
\*G. Aitchison, 150, *Harley Street, W.*  
C. Alderson, 40, *Beaufort Gardens, W.*  
\*W. C. Alexander, *Aubrey House, Kensington*.  
Mrs. Alexander, *Aubrey House, Kensington*.  
Mrs. Anderson, 57, *Upper Berkeley Street, W.*  
Sir W. R. Anson, Bart., *All Souls', Oxford, and 39, Portland Place*.  
Rev. R. Green Armytage, 6, *Rotbwell Street, Primrose Hill*.  
\*T. Armstrong, 121, *Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square*.  
Rev. S. Arnott, *The Vicarage, Turnham Green*.  
Henry Ashby, 8, *Bartholomew Road, Kentish Town*.  
Job Ashton, *Champion Park, Denmark Hill*.  
J. E. Backhouse, *Harworth Grange, Darlington*.  
H. F. Bacon, *Bury St. Edmunds*.  
A. Baldwin, *Wilden House, Stourport*.  
\*Eustace Balfour, 32, *Addison Road, W.*, Honorary Secretary.  
Sutherland Banner, 24, *North John Street, Liverpool*.  
Rev. A. Barff, *Choir House, St. Paul's*.  
\*J. W. Barnes, *The Bank, Durham*.  
Mrs. Barnes, *Gilling Castle, York*.  
F. B. Barwell, 8, *Vicarage Lane, Kensington*.  
A. Bass, M.P., 101, *Eaton Square, S.W.*  
C. H. Bayley, *West Bromwich, Birmingham*.  
\*Rt. Hon. Earl of Bective, M.P., 8, *Hamilton Place, Piccadilly*.  
T. Hugh Bell, *Red Barns, Coatham, Redcar*.

Newton Benett, *Fritbam, Lyndhurst.*

G. Nevitt Bennett, 21, *Montague Square, W.*

\*J. F. Bentley, 13, *John Street, Adelphi.*

J. B. Bevan, *St. Mark's Square, Regent's Park.*

E. Birchall, 2, *Park Place, Leeds.*

\*Dr. Birdwood, *India Office, Whitehall, S.W.*

Rev. W. J. Blew, M.A., 16, *Warwick Gardens, Pall Mall East.*

Jas. L. Bowes, *Queen's Buildings, Dale Street, Liverpool.*

W. Bowman, F.R.S., *Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.*

\*G. P. Boyce, *West House, 33, Glebe Place, Chelsea.*

Henry Bowman Brady, F.R.S., *Hillfield, Gateshead.*

\*H. W. Brewer, 28, *Portland Road, Notting Hill, W.*

†James Bromley, *The Homestead, Junction Lane, Lathom, near Ormskirk.*

\*Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, 1, *Manchester Square, W.*

Edwin Brough, *Leek, Staffordshire.*

W. S. Brough, *Leek, Staffordshire.*

\*James Bryce, M.P., 7, *Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.*

A. Burrell, 2, *Fermyn Street, S.W.*

\*F. W. Burton, F.S.A., 43, *Argyle Road, W.*

Mrs. Jos. Bush, *Codicote Lodge, Welwyn, Herts.*

Rev. F. Brisbane Butler, M.A., *Haileybury College.*

†John Bunney, *Fondamenta San Biagio 2143, Venice.*

\*Ingram Bywater, *Exeter College, Oxford.*

Rev. Donald Campbell, *Eye Vicarage, Suffolk.*

G. F. Campfield, 2, *Myrtle Villas, Muswell Hill.*

\*Rt. Hon. Lord Carlingford, 7, *Carlton Gardens, W.*

\*Thomas Carlyle, 5, *Great Cheyne Row, Chelsea.*

\*J. Comyns Carr, 19, *Blandford Square, N.W.*

Miss Henrietta Casey, *The Park, Nottingham.*

†Dr. Caulfield, *Queen's College, Cork.*

\*H. J. Chamberlain, 53, *Ann Street, Birmingham,*

Alex. Christie, 35, *Canonbury Square, N.*

Henry Clark, *Exchange Buildings, Liverpool.*

John Willis Clark, 1, *Scroope Terrace, Cambridge.*

- \*C. G. Clement, *St. James's Lodge, Storey's Gate.*  
G. Clulow, 87, *Caversham Road, N.W.*  
Miss Cobden, 14, *York Place, Baker Street, W.*  
Miss Annie Cobden, 14, *York Place, Baker Street, W.*  
Miss Jane Cobden, 14, *York Place, Baker Street, W.*  
†\*Professor S. Colvin, *Savile Club, S.W.*  
J. A. Cossins, *Upper Temple Street, Birmingham.*  
\*Leonard Courtney, M.P., *Reform Club.*  
The Baroness Burdett-Coutts, *Stratton Street, Piccadilly, and Highgate.*  
\*His Excellency the Earl Cowper, K.G., Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.  
Walter Crane, *Beaumont Loop, Shepherd's Bush.*  
†Joseph Crawhall, *Newcastle-on-Tyne.*  
Rev. M. Creighton, M.A., *Embleton Vicarage, Chatbill, Northumberland.*  
Miss Crowe, 17, *Cunningham Place, St. John's Wood.*  
Mrs. Wm. Crum, *Mere Old Hall, Knutsford.*  
P. A. Daniel, 6, *Gray's Inn Square, W.C.*  
\*Sir Geo. Webb Dasent, *Belgrave Mansions, S.W.*  
†J. Davenport, *Malmesbury.*  
Rev. Gerald S. Davies, *Charterhouse, Godalming.*  
\*W. De Morgan, 11, *Great Cheyne Row, Chelsea.*  
Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., 76, *Sloane Street, S.W.*  
Frank Dillon, 13, *Upper Phillimore Gardens, W.*  
A. B. Donaldson, 10, *Argyle Road, Kensington.*  
Wm. D. Robinson Douglas, *Orchardton, Castle Douglas, N.B.*  
John Douglas, 6, *Abbey Square, Chester.*  
\*Richard Doyle, *Athenæum Club.*  
Miss Duckworth, *Sussex Lodge, Hyde Park Gate South.*  
W. Edis, 14, *Fitzroy Square, W.*  
Fredk. Edridge, *Croydon.*  
\*F. S. Ellis, 29, *New Bond Street, W.*  
M. C. Embleton.  
\*Rev. Whitwell Elwin, *Bopton Rectory, Norwich.*

Miss Escombe, *The Grove, Penshurst, Tunbridge.*

W. Esson, *Merton College, Oxford.*

T. W. Evans, M.P., *Allestree, Derby.*

W. Herbert Evans, *Forde Abbey, near Chard.*

Miss Ewart, 3, *Morpeth Terrace, Victoria Street, S.W.*

T. M. Fallow, *Chapel Allerton, Leeds.*

\*C. J. Faulkner, *University College, Oxford.*

Mrs. Fawcett, 51, *The Lawn, South Lambeth Road.*

Rev. J. P. Fawcett, *Whitelands College, Chelsea, W.*

John Feeney, *Stephenson Chambers, Birmingham.*

†R. S. Ferguson, F.S.A., *Lowther Street, Carlisle.*

Richard Fisher, *Hill Top, Midhurst, Surrey.*

W. H. Fisk, *Park Road Studios, Park Road, Haverstock Hill, N.W.*

E. Fitzgerald, *Little Grange, Woodbridge, Suffolk.*

Lady Fitzhardinge, *Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire.*

\*Wickham Flower, 47, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea.*

J. Lewis Ffytche, F.S.A., *Thorpe Hall, Ethington, Lincolnshire and 20, Chester Square, W.*

†S. Russell Forbes, 10 and 11, *Piazza di Spagna, Rome.*

T. B. W. Forster, *Holt, Trowbridge, Wilts.*

Birkett Foster, *The Hill, Witley, Surrey.*

James Gairdner, *Public Record Office, Chancery Lane.*

Lady Alice Gaisford, *Offington, Worthing.*

Miss A. Garrett, 2, *Gower Street, W.C.*

\*Miss R. Garrett, 2, *Gower Street, W.C.*

John Giles, 29, *Albion Street, Hyde Park.*

W. Edgar Graham, 5, *St. Andrew's Place, Regent's Park.*

The Ven. Archdeacon Grant, *St. Albans.*

J. Greaves, *Malvern.*

Edward Green, 47, *Upper Grosvenor Street.*

Prof. A. G. Greenhill, *Royal Artillery Institution, Woolwich.*

†\*Rev. Canon Greenwell, *Durham.*

Joseph Grimshire, 1, *Parkholme Road, Dalston.*

Dr. A. B. Grosart, *Park View, Blackburn, Lancashire.*



- \*Hon. Norman Grosvenor, 35, *Park Street, Grosvenor Square.*
- \*Hon. Richard C. Grosvenor, 35, *Park Street, Grosvenor Square,*  
Honorary Secretary.
- George Grove, D.C.L., 30, *Bedford Street, Strand, W.C.*
- Miss Ghafin Grove.
- †Monsieur A. Guillon, 10, *Boulevard de Clichy, Paris.*
- †Chas. Hadfield, *Corn Exchange Chambers, Sheffield.*
- Rev. John H. Hall, B.A., F.S.A., *Crawe Rectory, Market Harboro'.*
- †T. H. Hall Caine, *Liverpool.*
- Professor Hales, 1, *Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill.*
- W. Matthew Hales, 4, *Manchester Street, Manchester Square.*
- †Augustus J. C. Hare, *Holmburst, Hastings.*
- \*Major Alfred Heales, *The Chimes, Streatham Common.*
- J. Aldam Heaton, 29, *Bloomsbury Square.*
- Miss Heaton, 6, *Woodhouse Square, Leeds.*
- \*John Hebb, *Metropolitan Board of Works, Spring Gardens, and*  
7, *Avenue Park Road, Lower Norwood.*
- Wm. Hebb, *Ross, Herefordshire.*
- Rev. Prebendary Hedgeland, *Penzance, Cornwall.*
- Mrs. James Hemery, *Gladsmuir, Hadley, Barnet.*
- Harry Hems, *Exeter.*
- W. J. Hennessy, *Le Manoir de Pennedepie près Honfleur,*  
*Calvados, France.*
- Miss Henrietta Casey, *The Park, Nottingham.*
- F. Henshaw, *Green Lanes, Small Heath, near Birmingham.*
- \*J. P. Heseltine, 196, *Queen's Gate, S.W.*
- Albert Heymann, *West Bridgford, Notts.*
- E. Hicks, M.P., *Garrick Club.*
- Gray Hill, *Water Street, Liverpool.*
- James Hilton, 60, *Montague Square, Hyde Park, W.*
- A. J. Hipkins, 100, *Warwick Gardens, W.*
- \*J. E. Hodgson, A.R.A., 5, *Hill Road, Abbey Road, St. John's*  
*Wood.*
- †J. Stewart Hodgson, 8, *Bishopsgate Street, E.C., and Haslemere*  
*Surrey.*

- J. Holland, 57, *Lancaster Gate, Kensington Gardens.*  
 Professor T. E. Holland, *All Souls', Oxford.*  
 F. Holliday, *Sutton Road, Erdington, Birmingham.*  
 Henry Holliday, *Oaktree House, Hampstead.*  
 †\*James R. Holliday, 101, *Harborne Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 †John Honeyman, 140, *Bath Street, Glasgow.*  
 H. J. Hood, 2, *Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*  
 \*Rt. Hon. Lord Houghton, 6, *Clifford Street, W.*  
 \*George Howard, 1, *Palace Green, Kensington.*  
 \*Samuel Huggins, *Little Sutton, near Chester.*  
 Arthur Hughes, *Wandle Bridge, Wallington, Surrey.*  
 R. Tierney Hughes, 55, *Cornhill.*  
 Francis Hullah, 5, *Cornwall Residences, Clarence Gate.*  
 \*W. Holman Hunt, 2, *Warwick Gardens, Kensington, W.*  
 \*A. W. Hunt, 1, *Tor Villas, Campden Hill, W.*  
 Mrs. Hussey, "*The Close*," *Salisbury.*  
 A. Granger Hutt, *Oxford Road, Kilburn, N.W.*  
 J. D. Hutchinson, M.P., *Birks Hall, Halifax, Yorkshire.*  
 Colin Hunter, *Lugar Lodge, Melbray Road, W.*  
 Rev. W. Hutchinson, *Howden Vicarage, E. Yorkshire.*  
 Edward Hutchinson, *The Elms, Darlington.*  
 Aleko Ionides, 1, *Holland Park, Notting Hill.*  
 L. A. Ionides, 16, *Holland Villas Road, Kensington.*  
 Miss Ella Jacob, *The Close, Salisbury.*  
 Sydney James, B.A., *Eton College.*  
 Rev. T. W. Jex-Blake, D.D., *School House, Rugby.*  
 \*E. Burne Jones, *The Grange, North End Road, Fulham.*  
 James Jones, 2, *Prospect Place, Upper Clapton.*  
 W. H. Hammond-Jones, *Witley, Surrey.*  
 \*Charles Keene, 4, *Queen's Road, Chelsea.*  
 \*William Kenrick, *The Grove, Harborne Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 \*S. Wayland Kershaw, M.A., *The Library, Lambeth Palace.*  
 Lieut.-Col. V. A. King, *Point of Ayr, Oxton, Cheshire.*  
 C. P. Knight, *St. Andrew's Street, Tiverton.*

*List of Members.*

51

- E. R. Lankester, *Exeter College, Oxford.*  
Rev. P. N. Leaky, *Parracombe Rectory, Barnstaple.*  
J. Leathart, *Brackendine, Gateshead.*  
†S. Leighton, M.P., *Sweeny Hall, Oswestry.*  
\*Charles G. Leland.  
George Leslie, R.A., 8, *Grove End Road, N.W.*  
Mrs. H. Leslie, *Longmead, Remenham Hill, Henley-on-Thames.*  
Rafe O. Leycester, 6, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, and Toft, Knutsford, Cheshire.*  
Wm. Linnell, *Hills Brough, Red Hill.*  
W. E. H. Lecky, 38, *Onslow Gardens, South Kensington.*  
R. B. Litchfield, 4, *Bryanston Street, Portman Square, W.*  
\*Rev. W. J. Loftie, *Burlington Fine Arts Club, W.*  
H. Longden, *Phoenix Foundry, Sheffield.*  
W. H. D. Longstaffe, *Gateshead.*  
\*Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., *High Elms, Down, Beckenham, Kent.*  
Henry Lucas, 46, *Gloucester Square, Hyde Park.*  
Vernon Lushington, Q.C., 21, *New Street, Spring Gardens.*  
†H. E. Luxmoore, *Eton College, Windsor.*  
\*Norman Maccoll, 18, *Manchester Street, Manchester Square.*  
Fitzherbert Macdonald.  
P. J. Mackeson, *Newlands, Tooting Common, S.W.*  
\*Frederick Macmillan, 2, *Elm Tree Road, St. John's Wood, N.W.*  
Dr. Macnamam, *Uxbridge.*  
A. Mackey, *Trowbridge, Wilts.*  
J. H. S. Mann, 2, *Camden Studios, 28a, Camden Street.*  
†Rev. Newton Mant, *The Parsonage, Sledmere, York.*  
\*Alfred Marks, 52, *Cornhill, London, E.C., Honorary Treasurer.*  
\*H. Stacy Marks, R.A., 15, *Hamilton Terrace, St. John's Wood.*  
C. E. Matthews, *Oakgate, Angustus Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
†J. H. Mayo, *Guildford, Surrey.*  
Jno. Henry Metcalfe, 28, *Well Walk, Hampstead.*  
Edgar J. Meynell, *Durham.*

- \*Henry Middleton, 4, *Storey's Gate, Westminster.*  
 John Midland, *Field Court, Gray's Inn Lane, W.C.*  
 J. E. Millais, R.A., 2, *Palace Gate, Kensington.*  
 \*A. B. Mitford, 100, *Cheyne Walk, Chelsea.*  
 W. H. Monck, *Clapham Common.*  
 C. J. Monro, *Hadley, Barnet, Herts.*  
 \*F. W. Moody, 97, *Grosvenor Road.*  
 \*William Morris, 26, *Queen Square, Bloomsbury, London, W.C.,*  
 Honorary Secretary.  
 H. W. Mozley, M.A., *Eton College.*  
 \*Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella, M.P., 16, *Elvaston Place, Queen's Gate.*  
 C. Fairfax Murray, *Sienna, Tuscany,* Honorary Corresponding  
 Secretary for Italy.  
 Mrs. Newall, *Ferndene, Gateshead, Durham.*  
 Sydney J. Nicolle, 42, *Fermyn Street, S.W.*  
 Wm. Niven, *Parkhurst, Epsom.*  
 †\*Rev. T. W. Norwood, F.G.S., *Wrenbury Vicarage, Nantwich.*  
 \*J. W. Oakes, A.R.A., *Leam House, Addison Road.*  
 Professor D. Oliver, F.R.S., *Royal Gardens, Kew.*  
 Rev. Geo. Ormsby, M.A., F.S.A., *Fisblake Vicarage, Doncaster.*  
 \*W. W. Oules, A.R.A. 43, *Bloomsbury Square.*  
 Professor E. H. Palmer, *St. John's College, Cambridge.*  
 E. Lawley Parker, *Chad Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 Lady Maude Parry, 24, *Upper Phillimore Place, Kensington, W.*  
 \*Coventry Patmore, *The Mansion, Hastings.*  
 \*Rev. Mark Pattison, *Lincoln College, Oxford.*  
 C. Kegan Paul, 1, *Paternoster Square, E.C.*  
 †Edward Peacock, *Bottesford Manor, Brigg, Lincolnshire.*  
 Wm. Pearce, *Solihull, Birmingham.*  
 H. Pelham, 8, *Broadsmore Road, Oxford.*  
 R. Kyrke Penson, F.S.A., *Dinham House, Ludlow.*  
 I. E. Mansel Pleydell, B.A., F.G.S., F.L.S., *Whatcombe, Blandford,*  
*Dorset.*  
 J. H. Pollen, 11, *Pembridge Crescent, W.*  
 C. E. Powell, *Rolls Chambers, 89, Chancery Lane.*

- T. W. Powell, *St. Catherine's, Guildford.*  
 Miss Powell, *St. Catherine's, Guildford.*  
 Miss E. G. Powell, *Piccardi Rough, St. Catherine's, Guildford.*  
 Henry Power, 37A, *Great Cumberland Place, Hyde Park, W.*  
 \*E. J. Poynter, R.A., 28, *Albert Gate.*  
 Cormell Price, *United Service School, Westward Ho, North Devon.*  
 H. D. Pulford, 11, *Holland Villas Road, W.*  
 Thomas Purdue.  
 Horatio N. Pym, 100, *Harley Street, W.*  
 George Rae, *Devonshire Road, Birkenhead.*  
 R. W. Raper, *Trinity College, Oxford.*  
 Harold Rathbone, 24, *Great Russell Street, W.C.*  
 Philip Rathbone (*Messrs. Rathbone, Martin & Co.*), *Liverpool.*  
 W. J. Rawlinson, 25, *Westbourne Square, W.*  
 \*G. W. Reid, *Keeper of the Prints, British Museum.*  
 Walter Rew, 17, *Bristol Gardens, Maida Hill.*  
 H. T. Richmond, 20, *York Street, Portman Square.*  
 J. Richmond, 20, *York Street, Portman Square.*  
 \*Professor W. B. Richmond, *Beavor Lodge, Hammersmith.*  
 \*Mrs. R. Thackeray-Ritchie.  
 Dr. Lloyd Roberts, 23, *Saint John's Street, Manchester.*  
 J. C. Robinson, 10, *York Place, Portman Square.*  
 T. W. A. Robinson, *Houghton-le-Spring, Durham.*  
 Vincent Robinson, 34, *Wigmore Street, W.*  
 \*E. R. Robson, *School Board for London, Victoria Embankment.*  
 Rev. Thomas Rogers, M.A., *The Grove, Durham.*  
 \*G. F. Rolph, 16, *Bedford Gardens, Campden Hill, Kensington.*  
 G. Freeth Roper, 4, *Garden Court, Temple.*  
 John W. Rose, *Old Hall, Reedham, Great Yarmouth.*  
 W. M. Rossetti, 5, *Endsleigh Gardens, N.W.*  
 \*Professor John Ruskin, D.C.L., *Oxford.*  
 G. A. Sala, 46, *Mecklenburgh Square.*  
 Rev. A. H. Sayce, *Queen's College, Oxford.*  
 Sir Sibbald Scott, Bart., 18, *Cornwall Gardens, Queen's Gate.*  
 \*W. B. Scott, *Bellevue House, Chelsea.*



- Alfred Seymour, 5, *Chesterfield Gardens, Mayfair.*  
 Rev. C. F. Seymour, *The Rectory, Winchfield, Hants.*  
 Henry Seymour, 91, *Victoria Street, S.W.*  
 J. Shand, 75, *Upper Ground Street, Blackfriars Road.*  
 G. Shaw, *Upper Temple Street, Birmingham.*  
 J. Sidebotham, F.R.A.S., *Bowden, Cheshire.*  
 Richard Sisley, *Ockford House, Godalming.*  
 Edwin Smith, *Elvetnam Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 Mrs. Eustace Smith, 52, *Prince's Gate.*  
 F. W. Smith, F.S.A., 51, *Clapton Common, E.*  
 Miss Leigh Smith, *Campagne Monifeld, Mustapha Supérieur, Algeria.*  
 Professor W. Robertson Smith, 83, *Crown Street, Aberdeen.*  
 \*Temple Soanes, *Pembury Grange, Tunbridge Wells.*  
 Hugh Stannus, 118, *Kennington Park Road, S.E.*  
 Miss Julia Stapleton, *Remenham Hill, Henley-on-Thames.*  
 \*Leslie Stephen, 13, *Hyde Park Gate South.*  
 \*F. G. Stephens, 10, *The Terrace, Hammersmith, W.*  
 Darell Stephens, F.G.S., *St. Stephen's, Plympton, Devon.*  
 M. Stephenson, *Molesworth Cottage, Beverley, Yorks.*  
 Miss E. C. Stevenson, 13, *Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh.*  
 N. Stevenson, 51, *Wimpole Street.*  
 J. C. Stevenson, M.P., *Westoe, South Shields.*  
 \*J. J. Stevenson, 3, *Bayswater Hill, W.*  
 \*Rev. D. J. Stewart, 71, *Mornington Road, W.*  
 Marcus Stone, A.R.A., 1, *Langham Chambers, W.*  
 General Chas. Stuart, *Hoburne, Christchurch, Hants.*  
 W. Larner Sugden, *Leek, Staffordshire.*  
 \*L. Alma Tadema, R.A., *Townsend House, North Gate, Regent's Pk.*  
 \*Rt. Hon. Lord Talbot de Malahide, F.R.S., F.S.A., F.G.S.,  
     F.R.G.S., 81, *Fermyn Street, S.W.*  
 Edward Taylor, *Hockerill, Bishop Stortford.*  
 Miss Helen Taylor, 10, *Albert Mansions, S.W.*  
 \*H. Virtue Tebbs, 1, *St. John's Gardens, Notting Hill.*  
 Wm. Teulon, 18, *Upper Woburn Place, Tavistock Square.*

- W. J. Thoms, F.S.A., 40, *St. George's Square, S.W.*  
 H. R. Thorpe, 9, *Park Terrace, Nottingham.*  
 †Mrs. Roby Thorpe, *The Park, Nottingham.*  
 Rev. Godfrey Thring, 18, *Kensington Gate, Hyde Park, W.*  
 J. R. Thursfield, 11, *Montague Place, Russell Square.*  
 Samuel Timmins, F.S.A., *Elvetham Lodge, Edgbaston, Birmingham.*  
 Rev. A. Trower, *The Rectory, St. Mary-at-Hill, Eastcheap.*  
 \*Stephen Tucker, *Somerset Herald, Herald's College, E.C.*  
 G. I. F. Tupper, 19, *Champion Grove, Denmark Hill.*  
 \*H. F. Turle, *The Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.*  
 Miss C. Turle, *The Cloisters, Westminster Abbey.*  
 W. H. Urwick, 34, *Great Tower Street, E.C.*  
 H. Vaughan 28, *Cumberland Terrace, Regent's Park*  
 \*Rev. Canon Venables, *The Precentory, Lincoln.*  
 Frederick Verney, *Devonshire Club, St. James's, S.W.*  
 Sir Harry Verney, Bart., M.P., 32, *South Street, Park Lane.*  
 Rev. Hamilton Stewart Verschoyle, *Villa de Angelis, Preno San Dominico, Fiesole, Italy.*  
 \*C. G. Vinall, 43, *Guilford Street, W.C.*, Honorary Secretary.  
 Rev. H. Wace, 8, *Mecklenburgh Square.*  
 J. L. Walker, 6, *Albany Courtyard, W.*  
 Frederick Wallen, 108, *Gower Street, W.C.*  
 Henry Wallis, 24, *Brecknock Crescent, Camden Road, N.W.*  
 †Rev. A. V. Walters, 5, *Upper High Street, Winchester.*  
 R. E. Egerton-Warburton, *Arley Hall, Northwich, Cheshire.*  
 \*G. Y. Wardle, 9, *Charlotte Street, Bedford Square.*  
 †\*T. Wardle, *St. Edward Street, Leek.*  
 G. C. Warr, *Holly Terrace, Hampstead.*  
 A. Waterhouse, A.R.A., 20, *New Cavendish Street, W.*  
 G. F. Watts, R.A., *Little Holland House, Kensington.*  
 T. W. Watts.  
 H. S. Webb, *Welwyn, Herts.*  
 \*P. Webb, 1, *Raymond Buildings, Gray's Inn.*  
 Thos. Wells, 14, *Manchester Square, W.*

- John Westlake, Q.C., LL.D., 16, *Oxford Square, W.*  
Denham Westmacott, 1, *Kensington Gate, W.*  
\*Rt. Hon. Earl of Wharnccliffe, *Wharnccliffe House, Curzon Street, W.*  
\*F. A. White, *Kinross House, Cromwell Road, N.W.*  
John Whitwell, M.P., *Kendal.*  
J. W. Whymper, *Haslemere.*  
†Rev. R. Y. Whytehead, *Nunkeeling Vicarage, Bewholme, Hull.*  
Miss Williams, 4, *Vicarage Gate, Kensington, W.*  
\*T. J. Willson, 3, *Southampton Street, Fitzroy Square.*  
Robert P. Wilson, 9, *Cumberland Terrace West.*  
Thos. T. Wing, 17, *Woburn Square, W.C.*  
J. R. Wise, *Edwinstowe, Notts.*  
\*A. Stuart Wortley, M.P., 6, *William Street, Knightsbridge.*  
H. Woolner, *Etruria Hall, Stoke-upon-Trent.*  
\*W. Aldis Wright, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*  
†\*Hon. Percy Wyndham, M.P., 44, *Belgrave Square.*  
Keith D. Young, 30, *Guilford Street, Russell Square, W.C.*  
\*Monsieur Chas. Yriarte.  
\*Count Zorzi, c/o John Bunney, *Fondamenta San Biagio 2143, Venice.*

(254) 62